

D 523 S5
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO



3 1822 01168 1228

SIXTY
AMERICAN
OPINIONS ON
THE WAR

LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA

SAN DIEGO



3 1822 01168 1228

Central University Library

University of California, San Diego

Please Note: This item is subject to recall.

Date Due

U.C.S.D.

MAY 17 1994

INTERLIBRARY LOAN

SIXTY AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

**THE AMERICAN *versus*
THE GERMAN VIEW OF THE WAR.**

By MORTON PRINCE, M.D.

Paper cover, 1s. net.

Dr. Morton Prince, one of the ablest of American psychologists, here presents his point of view as to the great war. His pamphlet is in great part a reply to pro-German propagandists: he is wholeheartedly on the side of the Allies, and puts very strongly, on a basis of documentary evidence, the case against Germany.

T. FISHER UNWIN, Ltd., LONDON

SIXTY AMERICAN
- OPINIONS -
ON THE WAR



LONDON:
T. FISHER UNWIN, LTD.
1 ADELPHI TERRACE W.C.

First published in 1915

[All rights reserved]

PREFACE

THE object of this little book is to show how many friends we have in America.

The selection of "American Views" does not pretend to be exhaustive. If time had allowed, it would doubtless have been easy to cite the favourable opinions of many other Americans as eminent as those here represented.

As a rule those individuals whose opinions have been published in book or pamphlet form are purposely quoted at much less length than those whose contributions have appeared in newspapers or private letters only.

The cordial thanks of the compilers are due to the Authors, Editors, and Publishers whose generosity has made the collection possible.

The contributions have, for obvious reasons, been arranged in alphabetical order.

S. R. H.
J. F. M.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
LAURENCE F. ABBOTT - - - - -	I
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS - - - - -	3
GEORGE BURTON ADAMS - - - - -	8
ADELBERT HENRY ALDEN - - - - -	9
ROBERT BACON - - - - -	13
JAMES MONTGOMERY BECK - - - - -	14
GEORGE LOUIS BEER - - - - -	17
EDWARD PRICE BELL - - - - -	24
POULTNEY BIGELOW - - - - -	30
EDGAR EWING BRANDON - - - - -	31
JOHN BURROUGHS - - - - -	34
JOHN JAY CHAPMAN - - - - -	38
JOSEPH H. CHOATE - - - - -	42
SAMUEL HARDEN CHURCH - - - - -	45
HELEN GRAY CONE - - - - -	50
RALPH ADAMS CRAM - - - - -	52
RICHARD HARDING DAVIS - - - - -	54
CHARLES WILLIAM ELIOT - - - - -	59
JOSEPH C. FRALEY - - - - -	65
JOHN CLINTON GRAY - - - - -	66
WILLIAM GRAHAM HALE - - - - -	69
HENRY NOBLE HALL - - - - -	72
GEORGE MCLEAN HARPER - - - - -	74
ALBERT BUSHNELL HART - - - - -	78
GEORGE HARVEY - - - - -	85
JOHN GRIER HIBBEN - - - - -	87
HENRY MARION HOWE - - - - -	89
WILLIAM DEAN HOWELLS - - - - -	90

	PAGE
HENRY JAMES - - - - -	92
ROBERT UNDERWOOD JOHNSON - - - - -	93
ROBERT M. JOHNSTON - - - - -	94
DAVID STARR JORDAN - - - - -	96
SINCLAIR KENNEDY - - - - -	98
GEORGE TRUMBULL LADD - - - - -	100
ARTHUR ONCKEN LOVEJOY - - - - -	104
WILLIAM MACDONALD - - - - -	106
JAMES BRANDER MATTHEWS - - - - -	108
CHARLES LEONARD MOORE - - - - -	114
SARA NORTON - - - - -	115
FRANK ILSLEY PARADISE - - - - -	118
CHARLES HENRY PARKHURST - - - - -	121
E. ALEXANDER POWELL - - - - -	122
MORTON PRINCE - - - - -	126
GEORGE HAVEN PUTNAM - - - - -	127
AGNES REPPLIER - - - - -	132
THEODORE ROOSEVELT - - - - -	135
FRANKLIN BENJAMIN SANBORN - - - - -	137
ELIZABETH SERGEANT - - - - -	140
ALBERT SHAW - - - - -	142
ALBION W. SMALL - - - - -	143
LANGDON CHEVES STEWARDSON - - - - -	147
CHARLES WILLIAM SUPER - - - - -	149
WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT - - - - -	150
JAMES MONROE TAYLOR - - - - -	151
GLANVILLE TERRELL - - - - -	154
WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER - - - - -	155
ROLAND USHER - - - - -	157
BARRETT WENDELL - - - - -	159
J. WILLIAM WHITE - - - - -	160
JASPER WHITING - - - - -	162
FREDERICK W. WHITRIDGE - - - - -	163

LAURENCE F. ABBOTT.

The following paragraphs appeared in "The Outlook" (N.Y.) for January 6th, 1915. Mr. Laurence F. Abbott, President of the "Outlook" Company, is a son of Dr. Lyman Abbott, the well-known preacher and author. Mr. Ernest H. Abbott, another son of Dr. Lyman Abbott, says that the opinions set forth "in substance express my father's views as they express the views of 'The Outlook' staff as a whole" :—

The present attitude of the governing class of Germany is diametrically opposed to the right principles of human freedom and progress. . . . It is to be hoped, for the sake of civilisation—not least for the sake of German civilisation—that Germany will be decisively beaten in the present conflict. . . . One of the pathetic things about the war is that the mass of the German people have been convinced by their military leaders that they are fighting to defend their hearths and homes. . . . The leaders of modern Germany wish to dominate Europe—the militarists for power's sake, the industrialists for the sake of commerce, and the intellectuals for the sake of imposing German ideals upon the world. The German Emperor, in yielding to the war party last August, committed a mistake which history is likely to record as the greatest ever made by a ruling monarch possessing such a moral power over his loyal people as the Kaiser undoubtedly possesses.

*

*

*

*

*

I am aware that in this war some Frenchmen are actuated by a spirit of revenge, that some Englishmen

2 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

are actuated by a spirit of jealousy, that some Russians are actuated by a spirit of aggrandisement. But, on the whole, I believe the Allies are fighting the battle for the liberty and the free development of the little State and of the unimportant individual. They are therefore fighting my battle. I believe it may be said in a very real sense that a victory of the German militarists will destroy the German people, and that a victory of the Allies will save them. I am not at all sure that it is not the moral duty of the United States, which stands for the principles of Cavour, Mazzini, and Garibaldi, of Grotius, Carl Schurz, and Gottfried Kinkel, of John Hampden, George Washington, and Abraham Lincoln, to take some public and outspoken position against the purpose of the German militarists to remake the map of Europe on the lines so graphically laid down by Professor Ostwald.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Charles Francis Adams, who attained the rank of Brigadier-General during the United States Civil War, was a prominent publicist and author, and a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Philosophical Society, and other learned bodies. Mr. Adams was the son of C. F. Adams, Ambassador to Great Britain during the Civil War (1861-65), and the direct descendant of two Presidents of the United States—John Adams, and John Quincy Adams. Mr. Adams died March 29th, 1915. The following letter to Lord Newton appeared in "The Spectator" for November 7th, 1914, and is here reproduced by permission of the Editor of "The Spectator" :—

South Lincoln, Mass.

October 21st, 1914.

MY DEAR LORD NEWTON,—As respects the war and the attitude of Great Britain the situation is very clearly understood in America, and the current of public opinion is all one way, and in your favour. You can safely leave the course of events and the trend of opinion to the representative Germans in this country, including more especially the Ambassador at Washington, von Bernstorff, who strikes me as being utterly unfit for his position. He has done the German cause immense harm and brought himself into great discredit. This, by indiscreet and unnecessary talking. The man apparently does not realise that foreign nations do not like to be everlastingly instructed as to their obligations, their duties, and the direction in which their sympathies should go forth. They are apt to think that, not being wholly devoid of common-sense, they are competent to form their own opinions.

4 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

They therefore invariably resent the schoolmaster and the propagandist. It was just so during our Civil War, when we sent out, to my father's great annoyance, a host of journalists, clergymen, lecturers, and characters otherwise eminent, to descend like a swarm of locusts on Great Britain and instruct the people of your community as to their moral obligations in the struggle then going on. It was on our part a mistake, and anything of the same character now would be a mistake on your part.

Moreover, as I have already intimated, the representative Germans over here are doing the cause of their "Fatherland," as they are pleased to call it, infinite injury. The sophistries and perversions of fact to which they have recourse are creative of more amusement than disgust even, and that is saying much. Under these circumstances you Englishmen, so far as America is concerned, can safely leave well enough alone. The current is all running your way, and the best thing you can do is to let it alone. The "scrap of paper" episode, the brutal violation of Belgian neutrality, the destruction of Louvain, the bombardment of the cathedral at Reims "did the job" here most effectually so far as the Germans are concerned. They are regarded in America now generally as a nation of neo-vandals. . . . The time had come and the conditions were ripe. Under these circumstances it was agreed between the potentates and war parties of the two nations that Austria-Hungary was to have full swing, or, as the Kaiser expressed it, a "free hand," as respects the Balkans. There the hegemony of Austria-Hungary was to be assured. On the other hand, Germany was to make France pay the expenses of the war, was to have an equally "free hand" so far as Belgium and Holland were concerned, and was to receive as part of the indemnity all the French extra-territorial colonial possessions. The thing is manifest; and there was hardly a pretence of

concealment. It is practically proclaimed throughout the various official publications—white, red, blue, and orange. Now we in America are not altogether devoid of common sense. We can see a thing when it hits us between the eyes. The present case was in point. The “Monroe Doctrine” looms a menace!

Thus much as respects the situation here; and you are entirely free to quote me as an authority on this topic. I do not want to see you English falling into the mistake which we Americans fell into fifty years ago. Let foreign public opinion take care of itself. As Hamlet long since observed; “When the wind is southerly I know a hawk from a hand-saw.”

Here, as with you in England, at present no one is thinking, talking, or reading of anything except Germany, German policy, the Kaiser, and the operations now going on in France and Belgium. The most ridiculous stories are prevalent of “barbarisms,” violations of every rule of humanity on one side, and the habitual digging out of the eyes of wounded Prussians by Belgian women on the other. The stuff which in this respect now fills our papers recalls to me strongly our own experiences fifty years ago, when in England it was widely asserted that we had carried the severities of warfare back to the days of Tilly and Wallenstein, and that the events in daily occurrence in America “simply staggered humanity.” This kind of twaddle is always prevalent whenever war breaks out. Meanwhile, I have seen reason to suppose that, so far as the Balkans and Turkey are concerned, it would be difficult to exaggerate what actually occurred. As to the Germans, you probably remember that when the first contingent of the German Army was sent out on the China Expedition in 1900, the Emperor personally addressed them in these words:—

“When you meet the foe you will defeat them. No quarter will be given; no prisoners will be taken. Let all who fall into your hands be at

6 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

your mercy. Just as the Huns a thousand years ago, under the leadership of Attila, gained a reputation in virtue of which they still live in historical tradition, so may the name of Germany become known in such a manner in China that no Chinaman will ever again dare to look askance at a German."

The Germans are now following out this precept. My friend General James H. Wilson, who commanded the American contingent in China, assures me that the atrocities perpetrated by the Germans there, especially as respects women, were something too atrocious for record: and, moreover, were unblushingly acknowledged as a regular feature of warfare. Wilson on this point is an authority. He knew from personal observation that whereof he spoke.

As to the outcome—I have had too many experiences of the uncertainties of warfare to venture any predictions. I well remember, for instance, that fifty years ago all England, with Mr. Gladstone at the head, declared that our war could have but one end, and that end was already "an accomplished fact"—the independence of the Confederacy. Lord Derby then asserted that the one utterly impossible result was the restoration of the old Union. I also have a distinct recollection of how subsequently Mr. Gladstone mounted the stool of repentance, and referred to his attitude and utterances at the previous time as a mistake of "inconceivable grossness." I do not, therefore, venture on any prediction; but I am strongly of opinion that the struggle can have but one result, if Great Britain retains its naval supremacy. It is only a question of time when Germany, shut up within its own limits, and throttled by a blockade, will get black in the face, and drop from inanition. The first indications of some such result are already apparent.

Meanwhile the cost in men, money, and material of the struggle is something I in vain try to grasp. I take

AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR 7

it that it is not unreasonable to say that, aggregating the six or eight combatants, including Belgium and Serbia, with Italy, Switzerland, and Roumania incurring the cost of mobilisation, the outgo is not less than ten millions sterling a day. I see it so computed in the *Economist*. I believe Germany already admits to a loss of life exceeding 300,000 or 150,000 a month. Adding the losses of France, Belgium, Austria-Hungary, and Russia, I see the total loss to date computed by careful investigators at 1,750,000, or nearly 30,000 for each day of active operations. This, if so, does indeed "stagger humanity"! As to the consumption of war material, the magazines which had been prepared in anticipation are now about exhausted, the winter is at hand, and European buyers are everywhere in America, purchasing, at about any price, whatever war supplies are to be had. It is stated in the papers that wheat in Berlin is now nine shillings a bushel; whereas in New York it is four and sixpence! As to horses, our market is being swept clear. Poor brutes!

You must overlook the length, and perhaps diffuseness of this letter. You know that, unable as I am because of eyes, etc., to write with my own hand, dictation has become with me a second nature. I simply talk on paper! In this particular case, knowing from you how solicitous the English are as to public opinion at this juncture in America, I have thought it worth while to speak with a good deal of detail and with some emphasis. You mix more or less with public men and those seeking to affect the course of events over here. You are very welcome in that connection to make any use you see fit of this letter, as it will merely contribute to a more correct understanding of what seems now in England to be a matter of general interest.

Believe me, etc.,

CHARLES F. ADAMS.

GEORGE BURTON ADAMS.

George Burton Adams, Litt.D., Professor of History at Yale University since 1888, is the author and editor of several historical works. The following extract is from "The Record" (Philadelphia) of November, 1914 :—

So much is at stake for civilisation in this war that Germany must not be allowed to win it, even if it becomes necessary for the United States to enter the conflict on the side of the Allies. . . . Germany represents in government and institutions an obsolescent system away from which the world has been advancing for generations. . . . If it comes to the point when it is necessary for the United States to aid the Allies to the end that they should win, then I hope it will be done. She (Germany) is opposed to everything for which we stand, and our turn would be next if Germany were successful.

ADELBERT HENRY ALDEN.

Adelbert Henry Alden, a direct descendant of John Alden of the "Mayflower," is a member of the New York Chamber of Commerce and of the Union League Club. He contributed the following article to the "Westminster Gazette" of March 19, 1915; and it is reproduced here by permission;—

Lincoln, when stumping the country for the Presidency, said, "No nation can exist one-half free and one-half slave." He was right. I apply that saying to the world. We do not live in two worlds; we live in one world. Oceans no longer separate nations; they connect them. The world cannot exist one-half armed and one-half unarmed. All must be equally armed, or all equally unarmed (preferably the latter); the one-half armed will enslave the half unarmed. The unarmed half cannot oppose the greed and ambition of the armed Empire, and will go down in suffering and misery.

One of the fundamental duties of a Government is to *know* what other Governments are doing and are preparing to do, and not be themselves "surprised" and "unprepared" to defend their liberty.

That is the danger to the best form of Government that has ever been devised, viz., Republican—a free Republic. History for 5,000 years shows us that no free Republic can continue alongside of an armed Empire. Despotism has more potential military force than a free Republic. The Republic goes under. The only hope for the Republic of France and the democracy of England is that both to-day have changed to Dictatorships. Democracy cannot wage war successfully

10 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

against a military Empire. The result of the present war will depend on whether the Dictatorships have come in time and with sufficient energy to take charge of unprepared and unorganised countries against an organised Absolute Monarchy. What makes all peaceful neutrals hope and pray for the Allies' success is the knowledge that at the end of a successful war the Governments will revert to the people, and that free Republican and democratic principles will revive and prevail. We know this from the character of the peoples and their history.

There is a subconsciousness in people ; this attribute leads them to conclusions ; it springs overnight, it is unexplainable ; I believe it to be quite different from a reasoning process. It makes public opinion. Once public opinion is formed it is difficult to change it. This subconsciousness in the American people sprang overnight to the sympathetic side of England and France ; the ground thus prepared was receptive ; Belgium, and German methods, fanned the American feeling ; there are no neutrals individually in America to-day. No one's feelings can be neutral ; the Government is—must be for the present—*that* is politics. I have read many explanations by America's great men of why America's sympathies are with the Allies.

The explanations are varied, almost as varied as the number of writers. None of them satisfies my mind. I attribute it to that subconsciousness which, without reasoning, unerringly impresses the people with the fear, perhaps even knowledge, that freedom is at stake for the world.

After untold centuries of suffering, poverty, and deprivation of human rights, the people struggled upward to liberty, freedom, and equality in the democracy of America, England, and France. The promised goal was in sight ; it had arrived in those three countries. The subconscious instinct of the people rightly jumped to the conclusion that the final great battle for freedom

AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR II

had commenced. They had hoped and believed that freedom and equality had been achieved, that they could rest from further struggle for those ends, and devote themselves to the social aims of improving the lot of mankind by raising the standard of life.

In the midst of working out these social problems for which civilisation seemed ready, the people refused to take the necessity for arming seriously. They had had enough of struggle, strife, and war. Armament was not popular, any aspirant for political honours or advancement lost votes if he advocated it. It required a strong man to oppose public opinion, and one by one politicians of all parties ceased to do it. The peaceful democracies of the world were therefore unprepared, unready, as the masses of the world have always been unprepared, and this is the cause of their having always been enslaved. The democracies of Europe have been suddenly and rudely awakened, they have gone back to the ranks, they have had to go, and fight for all they have achieved, hoping it is the last fight.

The American people have not reasoned this all out ; but they have a subconsciousness of it, hence it is their sympathies are with the Allies, without being able in words to formulate articulate reasons. They are far away ; that 3,000 miles of water waste which all of them or their ancestors have crossed is, in their minds, a great and sufficient barrier from old-world dominion or influence. And so it was in the days of Washington, when he gave the country the sound advice against entangling alliances or interference in European politics ! Sailing ships, slow mails, a minimum of foreign commerce, a nearly self-contained sufficiency for all wants. There were two worlds. America was living in one of them, far removed from the congested troubles of Europe which the inhabitants of America had escaped from. But times have changed. Science has changed the world into one world. What affects one country affects all countries ; not next week, next

12 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

month, next year, but within the hour. The American people have a subconsciousness of this, but they don't *know* it. They don't yet *know* they have more than sympathy for the Allies. They don't yet *know* that if the Allies lose, America's day of trial will come. It has been so stated many times. It is not believed. People find it difficult to believe what they don't want to believe ; it generally ends in their not believing it. If the masses of people were as intelligent and far-seeing as we sometimes like to believe them to be, there would not have been despotism in the world for the last 5,000 years. During all that period it is only 150 years since freedom has gained a foothold—this war indicates it is thus far *only* a foothold.

ROBERT BACON.

Robert Bacon was Secretary of State of the United States in 1899, and United States Ambassador to France from 1899 to 1912. The following extract appeared in the "New York Evening Post" for November 4th, 1914 :—

In the Hague Convention we have a real and intimate concern. That Convention was signed by the delegates from the United States and ratified by the United States Government, and it was signed and ratified by Germany, making it a treaty between Germany and the United States, in which the other ratifying Powers were joined.

In admittedly violating Articles I. and II. of that convention Germany broke a treaty she had solemnly made and entered into with the United States.

Are we to suffer a nation to break a treaty with us, on whatever pretext, without entering, at least, a formal protest? Will anyone contend that our neutrality imposes silence upon us under such conditions? Are the Hague Conventions to become "scraps of paper" without a single word of protest from this Government? If the treaties which we made at The Hague are to be so lightly regarded, then why not all our other treaties? As a matter of fact, it is our solemn duty to protest against a violation of pledges formally entered into between this Government and any other Government, and we assume a heavy moral responsibility when we remain silent. In this crisis, particularly, other nations look to us, and never, perhaps, has our example had greater force.

JAMES MONTGOMERY BECK.

James Montgomery Beck, LL.D., Assistant Attorney-General (1900-1903) in President Taft's administration, and universally recognised as one of the leading lawyers of America, recently published in the "New York Times" an article entitled "The Case of Belgium in the Supreme Court of Civilisation." This article has been reproduced in pamphlet and book form, and has already reached several hundreds of thousands of readers. It has also been published in a revised and extended form, under the title of "The Evidence in the Case," by Messrs. Putnam's Sons (price 2s. 6d.). Below we print his final verdict :—

These are the facts as shown by the record, and upon them, in my judgment, an impartial court would not hesitate to pass the following judgment :

(1) That Germany and Austria in a time of profound peace secretly concerted together to impose their will upon Europe and upon Servia in a matter affecting the balance of power in Europe. Whether in so doing they intended to precipitate a European war to determine the mastery of Europe is not satisfactorily established, although their whole course of conduct suggests this as a possibility. They made war almost inevitable by (a) issuing an ultimatum that was grossly unreasonable and disproportionate to any grievance that Austria had and (b) in giving to Servia, and Europe, insufficient time to consider the rights and obligations of all interested nations.

(2) That Germany had at all times the power to compel Austria to preserve a reasonable and conciliatory course, but at no time effectively

AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR 15

exerted that influence. On the contrary, she certainly abetted, and possibly instigated, Austria in its unreasonable course.

(3) That England, France, Italy, and Russia at all times sincerely worked for peace, and for this purpose not only overlooked the original misconduct of Austria but made every reasonable concession in the hope of preserving peace.

(4) That Austria, having mobilised its army, Russia was reasonably justified in mobilising its forces. Such act of mobilisation was the right of any sovereign State, and as long as the Russian armies did not cross the border or take any aggressive action no other nation had any just right to complain, each having the same right to make similar preparations.

(5) That Germany, in abruptly declaring war against Russia for failure to demobilise when the other Powers had offered to make any reasonable concession and peace parleys were still in progress, precipitated the war.

The writer of this article has reached these conclusions with reluctance, as he has a feeling of deep affection for the German people and equal admiration for their ideals and matchless progress. Even more he admires the magnificent courage with which the German nation, beset on every hand by powerful antagonists, is now defending its prestige as a nation. The whole-hearted devotion of this great nation to its flag is worthy of the best traditions of the Teutonic race. Nevertheless, this cannot alter the ethical truth, which stands apart from any considerations of nationality; nor can it affect the conclusion that the German nation has been plunged into this abyss by its scheming statesmen and its self-centred and highly neurotic Kaiser, who in the twentieth century sincerely believes that he is the proxy of Almighty God on earth, and therefore infallible.

16 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

In visiting its condemnation, the Supreme Court of Civilisation should therefore distinguish between the military caste, headed by the Kaiser and the Crown Prince, which precipitated this great calamity, and the German people.

The very secrecy of the plot against the peace of the world and the failure to disclose to the German people the diplomatic communications hereinbefore quoted, strongly suggest that this detestable war is not merely a crime against civilisation, *but also against the deceived and misled German people*. They have a vision and are essentially progressive and peace-loving in their national characteristics, while the details of their military caste are those of the dark ages.

One day the German people will know the full truth, and then there will be a dreadful reckoning for those who have plunged a noble and peace-loving nation into this abyss of disaster.

“The mills of God grind slowly,
But they grind exceeding small,
With patience He stands waiting,
With exactness grinds He all.”

GEORGE LOUIS BEER.

George Louis Beer was for several years lecturer on European History in the University of Columbia, and is the author of various works on the economic aspects of history. In 1913, the First Loubat Prize was awarded to him for the best work published in the English language during the preceding five years on the history, geography, or archæology of America. The article quoted below appeared in "The New York Times" :—

In the course of his solemn speech of August 8th, 1914, in the House of Commons, Sir Edward Grey quoted some remarks made by Gladstone in 1870 on the extent of the obligation incurred by the signatory powers to the Quintuple Treaty of 1839 guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium. Shorn from their context as they were, these sentences are by no means illuminating, and it cannot be said that their citation in this form by Sir Edward Grey was a very felicitous one. During the paper polemics of the past months these detached words of Gladstone have been freely used by Germany's defenders and apologists to maintain that Great Britain of 1870 would not have deemed the events of 1914 a *casus belli*, and that its entrance into the present war on account of the violation of Belgium's neutrality was merely a pretext. During the course of this controversy Gladstone's attitude has in various ways been grossly misrepresented, Dr. von Mach, of Harvard, even stating in the columns of *The New York Times* that Gladstone had declared the Treaty of 1839 "to be without force." But, apart from such patent distortions, Gladstone's real position is apparently not clearly defined in the mind of the general public, which is merely seeking for the unadulterated

18 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

truth, regardless of its effect upon the case of any one of the belligerents.

Shortly after the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war in 1870 the Prussian Ambassador in London informed Gladstone, then Prime Minister, that some time prior to the existing war France had asked Prussia to consent to the former country's absorption of Belgium, and that there was in the possession of the Prussian Government the draft of a treaty to this effect in the handwriting of M. Benedetti, then French Ambassador at Berlin. This communication was obviously made, as Lord Morley tells us, with the object of prompting Gladstone to be the agent in making the evil news public and thus of prejudicing France in the judgment of Europe. Gladstone thought this "no part of his duty," and very shortly thereafter, at the direct instance of Bismarck, this draft treaty of 1866-7 was communicated by Baron Krause, of the Prussian Embassy in London, to Delane, the editor of *The Times*. On July 25th, 1870, it was published in the columns of that paper and aroused considerable anxiety in England.

It immediately became imperative upon the British Government to take some action. As Gladstone wrote to Bright, the publication of this treaty

"has thrown upon us the necessity of doing something fresh to secure Belgium, or else of saying that under no circumstances would we take any step to secure her from absorption. This publication has wholly altered the feeling of the House of Commons, and no Government could at this moment venture to give utterance to such an intention about Belgium. But neither do we think it would be right, even if it were safe, to announce that we would in any case stand by with folded arms and see actions done which would amount to a total extinction of the public right in Europe."

AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR 19

A simple declaration of Great Britain's intention to defend the neutrality of Belgium by arms in case it were infringed seemed to Gladstone not to meet the special requirements of the case as revealed by the proposed treaty of 1866-7 between Prussia and France. His main object was to prevent the actual execution of such an agreement, by means of which the two belligerent powers would settle their quarrels and satisfy their ambitions at the expense of helpless Belgium. Hence, on July 30th, the British Government opened negotiations with France and Prussia and within a fortnight had concluded separate but identical treaties with each of these powers. According to these treaties, in case the neutrality of Belgium were violated by either France or Germany, Great Britain agreed to co-operate with the other in its defence. The preamble of these treaties states that the contracting powers

“being desirous at the present time of recording in a solemn act their fixed determination to maintain the independence and neutrality of Belgium,” as provided in the Treaty of 1839, have concluded this separate treaty, which,

“without impairing or invalidating the conditions of the said Quintuple Treaty, shall be subsidiary and accessory to it.”

Article III. further provided that these treaties of 1870 were to expire twelve months after the conclusion of the existing war, and that thereafter the independence and neutrality of Belgium would “continue to rest, as heretofore,” on the Treaty of 1839.

These documents tell a plain tale, which is amply confirmed by the proceedings in Parliament in connection with this matter. On August 5th, 1870, while the negotiations leading to the above-mentioned treaties were still pending, questions were raised in the House of Commons about the recently published

20 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

abortive Treaty of 1866-7 between Prussia and France. In reply, Gladstone stated that

“the Treaty of 1839 is that under which the relations of the contracting powers with Belgium are at present regulated”;

and that, while he could not explain the intentions of the Government “in a matter of this very grave character in answer to a question,” he hoped to be able to communicate some further information in an authentic manner. Three days later, as these treaties with France and Prussia had been virtually concluded, Gladstone was able to satisfy the anxiety of the House and outlined their terms. He explicitly stated that, after their expiration,

“the respective parties, being parties to the Treaty of 1839, shall fall back upon the obligations they took upon themselves under that treaty.”

After Gladstone had finished speaking, the leader of the Opposition, Disraeli, took the floor and pointed out that, as a general proposition,

“when there is a treaty guarantee so explicit as that expressed in the Treaty of 1839, I think the wisdom of founding on that another treaty which involves us in engagements may be open to doubt.”

But he accepted Gladstone's statement

“as the declaration of the Cabinet, that they are resolved to maintain the neutrality and independence of Belgium, I accept it as a wise and spirited policy, and a policy, in my opinion, not the less wise because it is spirited.”

Gladstone then replied, saying that the reason the Government had not made a general declaration of its intentions regarding Belgium was that much danger might arise from such a declaration and that inadvertently they might have given utterance to words

“that might be held to import obligations almost

unlimited and almost irrespectively of circumstances."

We had made up our minds, he continued, that we had a duty to perform, and we thought a specific declaration of what we thought the obligations of this country better than any general declaration. Referring to the two treaties in process of ratification, he concluded :

" We thought that by contracting a joint engagement we might remove the difficulty and prevent Belgium from being sacrificed."

The policy of the Government continued, however, to be criticised, mainly on the ground that the Treaty of 1839 amply covered the case. On August 10th, Gladstone defended his policy in the House of Commons in a speech pitched on a high moral plane, in which he dilated upon Belgium's historic past and splendid present and on Great Britain's duty to this little nation irrespective of all questions of its own self-interest. With genuine fervour, he exclaimed :

" If, in order to satisfy a greedy appetite for aggrandisement, coming whence it may, Belgium were absorbed, the day that witnessed that absorption would hear the knell of public right and public law in Europe. . . . We have an interest in the independence of Belgium," he continued, " which is wider than that which we may have in the literal operation of the guarantee. It is found in answer to the question whether under the circumstances of the case this country, endowed as it is with influence and power, would quietly stand by and witness the perpetration of the direst crime that ever stained the pages of history, and thus become participators in the sin."

What Gladstone had in mind was the scheme of 1866-7, by which France was to absorb Belgium, with Prussia's consent and aid. He distinctly stated that

22 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

the treaties of 1870 were devised to meet the new state of affairs disclosed by the publication of this incomplete treaty. It was in order to prevent the revival of such a conspiracy that Gladstone made separate and identical treaties in 1870 with France and Prussia. They were a practical device to secure an effectual enforcement of the treaty of 1839 under unforeseen and difficult circumstances. The agreement of 1870 was, as Gladstone said, a cumulative treaty added to that of 1839, and the latter treaty

“loses nothing of its force, even during the existence of this present treaty.”

During the course of this speech defending the Government's action against those critics who claimed that the Treaty of 1839 adequately met the situation, Gladstone made some general remarks about the extent of the obligation incurred by the signatories to the Treaty of 1839. Naturally, he did not refer to their bond not to violate the neutrality of Belgium—that was self-evident—but solely to their duty to prevent such action by any one else. He said :

“It is not necessary, nor would time permit me, to enter into the complicated question of the nature of the obligations of that treaty, but I am not able to subscribe to the doctrine of those who have held in this House what plainly amounts to an assertion that the simple fact of the existence of a guarantee is binding on every party to it, irrespectively altogether of the particular position in which it may find itself at the time when the occasion for acting on the guarantee arises.”

It is, of course, impossible to state precisely what were those unuttered thoughts that passed through Gladstone's mind as he spoke these characteristically cautious words, but what in general they were can be satisfactorily gleaned from a letter that he had written six days before this to John Bright. The

recommendation advocated in opposition to the policy adopted, he stated therein, is :

“ That we should simply declare *we* will defend the neutrality of Belgium by arms in case it should be attacked. Now, the sole or single-handed defence of Belgium would be an enterprise which we incline to think quixotic ; if these two great military powers [France and Prussia] combined against it—that combination is the only serious danger ; and this it is which by our proposed engagements we should, I hope, render improbable to the very last degree. I add for myself this confession of faith : If the Belgian people desire, on their own account, to join France or any other country, I for one will be no party to taking up arms to prevent it. But that the Belgians, whether they would or not, should go ‘ plump ’ down the maw of another country to satisfy dynastic greed is another matter. The accomplishment of such a crime as this implies would come near to an extinction of public right in Europe, and I do not think we could look on while the sacrifice of freedom and independence was in course of consummation.”

EDWARD PRICE BELL.

Mr. Bell is the London Correspondent of the "Chicago Daily News," a post which he has held for fifteen years, and he is also a successful writer of short stories. The following letter appeared in the "Daily Chronicle" for January 27th, 1915 :—

Whoever knows much of London knows that tempers here are rising—indeed, already are rather well up—on the subject of what America may do relative to contraband and to the German ships interned in American ports. One uses the phrase "what America may do," for thus far, strictly speaking, America would seem to have done nothing to warrant anger or alarm in this country. That these emotions prevail in Britain is comprehensible; that they are, or ever can be, warranted is inconceivable. Personally, I am delighted that attention has been called to them in a great, pro-American English journal, the *Spectator*, for I want our Government and our people to walk in the light, and not in the twilight—or the darkness.

One article in a London newspaper probably did more mischief from the Anglo-American point of view than has been done by everything else that has appeared on the pending questions between England and America. This article was non-malicious, even well-disposed to both countries. It pretended to interpret the American masses with reference to the expected seizure of the *Dacia*. It suggested the view that America would go crazy if England seized the *Dacia*, with the Stars and Stripes at her masthead. Non-malicious, well-intentioned, this article, in my opinion,

none the less was impertinent, shallow, fallacious and deplorable. If its author had been known the effect of the production might have been insignificant. The trouble was that it purported to come from someone entitled to speak for America. No Englishman could have been sure that it did not issue from really authoritative quarters. How ill at ease was the author himself as to his conclusions was indicated by his final paragraph—a paragraph in which he practically admonished the public not to take his lucubrations too seriously.

One feels safe in laying down these propositions :—

(1) That America will not attempt to liberate the interned German ships without an arrangement agreeable to England.

(2) That America will do its utmost to fortify itself against the charge of facilitating in any way the conveyance of contraband to Germany or Austria.

(3) That America means to hold tenaciously to its neutrality—a policy that debars it from countenancing any novel doctrine on the rights or duties of neutrals that would hamper England in the full use of its naval strength in its fight for life.

(4) That America—in every drop of its non-foreign blood, and in much of the latter—believes that autocratic and militarist Germany is the aggressor in this war; and that, if right and the best political and moral heritage of history are to survive, autocratic and militarist Germany must be reduced to permanent and self-realised impotence.

Let us suppose that the *Dacia* is seized—as she probably will be, and certainly ought to be. Let us suppose, even, that she goes before a Prize Court and is condemned and confiscated. What then? If England and America disagree about the matter, or if

26 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

they disagree about any future question connected with contraband or anything else, are they going to fly at each other like two hot-headed navvies? Are not both deeply—let us hope, irrevocably—committed to the theory and the practice of arbitration? Certain remarks one hears in these throbbing days would suggest that, overnight, the whole history, the very conception, of arbitration had vanished, and left not a rack behind. Do you remember how Sir Edward Grey fought for the peace of Europe? Do you think he would fight less strenuously for the peace of the English-speaking world? Aye; and do you fancy that even Sir Edward Grey, in this magnificent fight, would outdo Woodrow Wilson? I tell you he would not. And I say that in the hands of these men, come what may, peace between England and America is safe.

Disputes? Certainly we shall have them. How could it be otherwise, when our interests meet and interlock at countless points and in countless places? Do not Englishmen quarrel among themselves? Do not Americans quarrel among themselves? And, when these fraternal infelicities arise, is the appeal, generally speaking, to guns or knives, or to the rights and lefts, the hooks and swings and jabs, of Bombardier Wells and "Gunboat" Smith? Possibly the word arbitration stirs your scorn. Mayhap you are an international cynic. If so I ask you to remember that arbitration and peace went down in mud and blood the other day simply because one mighty and domineering nation chose to have it so.

All Europe, all the world, save Germany and its dupe, Austria, wanted peace. Germany wanted war. For the best part of half a century she had eaten, drunk, and slept war. She is a war-made and a war-making empire. To such a State arbitration is anathema. With arbitration what use would Germany have had for her terrible explosives and her monstrous

guns, and her immeasurable grey legions? To talk arbitration with a Power so inspired, organised, and equipped, is to waste one's breath. But to talk arbitration in respect of all disputes that possibly can arise between the British Empire and the United States is to talk one of the most reasonable and practical things in the world.

In your mind, I am well aware, there is a question: "Why is America so shy of the gentle art of protest?"

That is your question. My reply is that against the unspeakable infamies committed by Germany in this war America has protested, and protested with all its soul. True, much of this protest has baffled expression. But protest has been voiced in America, voiced by lip and pen, vehemently, brilliantly, again and again, from ocean to ocean. You are thinking of the gentlemen at Washington—a very different matter! Gentlemen in the highest official positions in all countries usually deem themselves bound to behave with extreme circumspection. It is thinkable that the caution, or over-caution, of a set of men of this class might lose for a country an opportunity dazzlingly great and noble. Such an opportunity, in my opinion, has been lost by America in this unprecedented crisis of the progress of the world. I would have had our Government protest—at the very least, get in the record right—against every illegal and dastardly act, every wanton assault upon civilisation, that has been done in this war. The gentlemen at Washington have not seen it in that way, and theirs have been the responsibility and the power. Of any ignoble motive I think they instantly may be declared innocent. It was not politics. It was not greed. It was not light or cynical expediency. It was serious and anxious patriotism, according to the light of those concerned.

You know we once had in the United States a

28 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

dangerous sectionalism. We might have something of the kind again. We do not like sectionalism and civil war—they are bitter things. You British would like to push the Germans back across the Rhine. It is not easy. We Americans would like to keep the Germans, *quâ* Germans, quiet in America, to have them act as if they were Americans first and Germans afterwards, particularly to arrest their painfully obvious drift towards sedition. It is not easy. We would ask you—if I may say so without too much immodesty—just to bear with their intrigue and their vocalism. They are doing what seems to them right—doing, I have little doubt, what you and we should do in like case. Let Mr. Wilson go on and act as he sees fit, and judge him in the end. You have noted the failure of the Dernburg campaign to swerve America from the true line of neutrality—a very dangerous movement against both the Allies and ourselves. Like schemes will come to nothing. We will not be gulled or bullied into any foolish or perilous course. Wilson may not say much. His silence may strike some as ominous. But, I dare believe he will keep his eye on the compass and his hand on the wheel, and the ship will bend to the right course, however hard beat the headwinds, and however high break the seas.

Freely admitting that most nations have their grave sins to answer for, as regards this matter of Anglo-American friendship—a thing that to me stands against all that is narrow and covetous and malicious and criminal and wrong in the international relations of the future—I always am thinking of the miserable way in which we misunderstand and harshly judge each other. Inevitably we are prone to forget the lesson that often one dislikes a man one does not know, and loves him when one knows him. I have alluded to the American Civil War. You have heard that it was caused by slavery. You have heard that it was caused by secession. You have heard that it was

caused by State sovereignty. You have heard that it resulted from climate and geography and the accidents of invention—the warm suns, the fertile farms by the southern rivers, the cotton gin, the steam-engine, the railways.

Wider and deeper than all these contributory causes, in my judgment, was a world-familiar group of human frailties, chief among them the great and calamitous frailty of ignorance. The North was ignorant of the South. The South was ignorant of the North. Between them was a deadline that truth could not cross. After the ancient fashion of human beings, the North and South misjudged and uncharitably judged each other. All that was good and generous and beautiful and magnificent in the two was forgotten. The result was everything from Sumter to Appomattox ! Now we know that a brief space of twenty-five years would have settled, automatically, both our grave questions—the question of slavery and the question of nationalism. Ignorance ! Ugly mother of a hideous brood ! To Englishmen and to Americans I say, keep the slurs off your lips ! Keep the slurs out of the headlines ! Just remember that slurs, execrable in themselves, belong to the multitudinous family of ignorance !

POULTNEY BIGELOW.

Poultney Bigelow, author, traveller, and military expert, is the son of John Bigelow, the United States Minister to France from 1864 to 1867. He has published, amongst other books, a "History of the German Struggle for Liberty" (4 vols.) and "The German Emperor and His Eastern Neighbours." The following sentences are from a private letter of December 14th, 1914 :—

The dignified attitude which England has maintained is the best for her and for us. Germany has helped the cause of the Allies much :—first, by her wanton invasion of Belgium ; secondly, by her clumsy justification of this strange behaviour. Germany maintains wearisome Press agents, who fill my wastebasket once a week—they do no harm to England—we here are accustomed to such methods. You have here plenty of friends who promptly resent pro-German diatribes.

EDGAR EWING BRANDON.

The following letter of Edgar Ewing Brandon, Dean and Acting-President of Miami University, Ohio, was written to Mr. O. J. Merkel, Secretary of the German University League, in the same circumstances as that of Albion W. Small (see page 143) :—

DEAR SIR, — I am in receipt of your letter of December 26th, and the enclosed address to the universities of America signed by Profs. Eucken and Haeckel. It is doubtless useless to expend time and energy in a reply to your communication, for the German war party seems determined to continue its subsidised propaganda in this country notwithstanding the untenable position in which it is placed and the futility of its efforts. If it were not for two things I would pass this letter in silence.

First, I desire to express my regret that the sympathisers of Germany in this country should detract from the dignity of the two illustrious professors who signed the address, and lower the honour of the institutions, for which they claim to speak, by spreading broadcast a document so violently partisan, and which shows on the face of it that it is based on only one-sided evidence. No educated American doubts the integrity of the two illustrious professors, or their ability to exercise sound judgment on matters where all the data are in their possession ; and it is just for this reason that educators in this country regret that such men should have been led, either through blind partisanship or through some other influence, to lower the dignity of scholarship by general accusations unsupported by facts and by making affirmations that known facts disprove.

32 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

We all, in America, know that for the month preceding the date of the university appeal the censorship in Germany was of the strictest kind. The distinguished professors, therefore, did not have at their disposal, when this appeal was formulated, the facts and documents that were at the disposition of the humblest American reader. I repeat, therefore, the sentiment with which I began this paragraph, namely, that it is an exceeding pity that men of this character should, in their blindness, have formulated such an unwarranted document. But they can be excused on account of their ignorance of the situation, enclosed as they were by the iron ring of German censorship. The greater pity is that German-Americans, or German agents in this country, who do have the opportunity to know the situation through the publication of facts and documents from all sides, have not enough at heart the good name of Germany and the honour of her universities to refrain from publishing such an unwarranted document, and one which is calculated to reflect so much discredit upon the institutions from which it comes, and its ill-informed authors.

Secondly, I desire as an American citizen, a descendant of families that have inhabited America for two centuries and who aided in establishing the independence and maintaining the integrity of this Republic, to protest against the subsidised German propaganda at present instituted in this country; against the efforts now being made in Congress by pro-Germans, to change the long-established laws in regard to neutrality; against the ephemeral associations such as yours which conceal their purpose under misleading names, and which have no other reason for existence than to spread false information and unsupported arguments in regard to the causes and occasion of the present European war; against the hyphenated American that detracts from the dignity, honour and even safety of our Republic; and finally against the

German assumption that the American reading public is ignorant of the facts of the case.

With the exception of a few days at the beginning of the war, telegraphic news has come from Germany, as well as from other countries that are engaged in the struggle. Mail routes have long been open through neutral countries. Every piece of news and every document that Germany desires to give to the world reaches our shores, and even yourselves will have to admit that the great metropolitan papers, whatever their sympathies, have published Germany's presentation of the case. Americans are not ignorant of the situation ; on the contrary, they are probably the best informed people in the whole world, and are able to appreciate best all sides of the controversy. For societies such as yours to organise and try to foist upon this well-informed public a set of indefensible arguments, written by men who were ignorant of everything except what the Government of Germany desired to put before them, is an arrogant assumption and unworthy of the word " university."

I judge from the letterhead that the so-called " German University League " has little organisation and no officers other than the executive secretary. I therefore appeal to you, Mr. Secretary, if you are an American citizen, not to stultify your own intelligence, or the intelligence of your fellow-citizens, by distributing such unwarranted and misleading documents as this publication of Profs. Eucken and Haeckel. If you are a German, enjoying the hospitality of America, I appeal to you to respect this hospitality, to refrain from insulting your hosts by presuming their ignorance and proclaiming the infallibility of German judgments made on censored news, and finally to trust a free and untrammelled Press of a free country to inform the people about the cause and progress of the war.

JOHN BURROUGHS.

John Burroughs, Litt.D., a well-known American naturalist who has published a long list of works, may be called the "Richard Jefferies" of America. He is a member of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, a leading authority on Walt Whitman, and a poet of no mean order ; he was in the service of the United States Government for about twenty years. His opinion, as expressed below, appeared in the "New York Tribune" :—

The events upon which we judge Germany stand out so that he who runs may read. They are written large in fire and blood across the face of a kingdom. They are written in the burned cities, in demolished cathedrals, in consumed libraries, in piratical indemnities, in aerial bombardment of defenceless women and children, and in the insolent and overweening spirit of domination that attends it all.

Do we need to know all the antecedents of these events—all the diplomatic or political history that led up to them ? We draw our conclusions from the events themselves. The facts are patent to all, namely, that Germany agreed to back Austria up in making demands upon Serbia that would have destroyed the latter's autonomy, and that Germany knew her course would precipitate a general European war. Then there lies Belgium—starving, homeless, bleeding Belgium—whose only sin was that she was a small kingdom and lay in the path of the German hosts. Belgium, who had never taken any part in war but the defensive part since Cæsar's time ; Belgium, one of the most peaceful and thrifty and humane nations in the world.

Do we need to know all the secret histories, all the diplomatic and political chicanery of the times, to judge of these events? Certain of the antecedent factors and conditions are patent to all, one of these being the growing feeling of distrust and rivalry that sprang from the conflict of commercial interests; another, race antagonism, with the survival of ancient feuds. But the chief factor was the growing military spirit of Pan-Germanism which begat the enormous armaments, built the military railways, and perfected the terrible war machine which has at last been ditched in Belgium and in Northern France.

Belgium's wrongs and Germany's crimes are present-day facts, and the lapse of time can never make them less. Time will soften or blur the harshness and the terrible reality of these events, but the murder and spoliation of this admirable and peaceful little State, just because she was little, will ever remain one of the blackest pages of modern history. No plea of dire necessity, no conjuring with right and wrong, can palliate the crime. When the impartial history of the war comes to be written, the blood and famine of this neutral and peaceful people will strike through and through its pages like some indelible and infernal stain. No matter what excuse Germany had for making war upon France, she had not the shadow of an excuse for destroying or seeking to destroy Belgium. Belgium's offence was the offence of a man who resists the passage of an assassin through his house seeking a short cut to the house of his neighbour.

Germany was bent on assassinating her neighbour and plundering her treasury, and we know why she wanted to do it quickly; but her fear of Russia, whom she had defied, and the tramp of whose gathering hosts were in her ear, does not make her crime any the less.

In what respect does the conduct of the German army differ for the better from that of the highwayman or the robber baron, who murders or overpowers

36 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

his victim and then takes or demands his treasures ? The money penalties which Germany has demanded of prostrate Belgium and the destruction that has strewn her path place her acts on a level with the murder and pillage of a band of common outlaws.

The Germans, echoing the Kaiser, unanimously declare that they did not want the war, that it was forced upon them, etc. If they could blot out the evidence of their long and exhaustive preparation for war, if they could prove to us that they had turned a deaf ear to the teachings and preachings of their prophets of war, or if we could believe that such men as Bernhardt and Treitschke were not a legitimate outgrowth of the national spirit, if they could show us that such a work as Professor Usher's "Pan-Germanism" was pure fiction, that it rested on no historical foundation, that Germany has not been cherishing the dream of world-empire during the reign of the Kaiser, and studying the problem from every point of view ; that her prodigious increase of armaments of late years was only an offering upon the altar of the goddess of peace ; that the military burden which her people so cheerfully took on was only a discipline in self-sacrifice, or that all those things were only to put "the fighting edge" upon German Kultur and keep it whetted against an invasion by her neighbours—if the advocates or apologists of the Kaiser could satisfy our minds upon these points, we would gladly welcome the proof. But the proof does not come. Her spokesmen slur over these points. They urge her need of expansion ; they throw in our faces her immense superiority to all other nations ; they stand upon her Kultur and challenge the whole world to dispute her Divine right to do what she pleases.

We have seen mild outbursts of Anglophobia in this country, but never before has the world witnessed the distemper plunging its victim into such frothing

and convulsive fury as Germany shows to-day. That dash of the German navy upon the coast of England was like an outburst of uncontrollable hatred and thirst for destruction. It was not the Germany we know in the peaceful walks of life ; it was the Germany drunk with the spirit of war in its worst form. It indicates a reversal to the spirit of primitive savagery which the whole world may well stand in dread of. The destruction of a battleship is legitimate warfare, but the murder of women and children in unfortified towns is the debauchery of war.

The total destruction of London with all its population by the Zeppelin airships would be in accord with the present temper of the Kaiser's army and navy. They are out to win, to dominate Europe by military might, and no considerations of humanity or of the rights of non-belligerents will for a moment stand in the way.

Let me add that in the present crisis this country should be very forbearing with the course of Great Britain on the high seas. England has everything at stake, and she is fighting our battles for us. We have nothing at stake but the big profits of some of our monopolies—our oil kings and copper kings—and we know that, by hook or crook, they will manage to survive.

JOHN JAY CHAPMAN.

John Jay Chapman, L.H.D., is the author of several volumes of essays, plays, and other works. The following extracts are from a small book entitled "Deutschland Über Alles, or Germany Speaks," published by Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons, with whose permission they are here reproduced :—

This is not so much a war as it is an outbreak of national fury transfused with the passion of fear. The great neutral public feels that there is in Germany an element of unreason, and instinctively opposes her as one would oppose any mad creature. . . . The Germans are, for the time being, more or less insane. . . . We now discovered that the literature of Pan-Teutonism, which, up to this time, we had taken to be a sort of bad joke, was a very serious matter—representing as it did Unreason Enthroned. Pan-Teutonism had been teaching that Germany must save mankind through bloodshed. . . .

To my mind, there is immense psychological interest in these exhibitions of pure, unadulterated patriotism. Their sincerity penetrates us: but the idea they convey is zero. Their message is, indeed, "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." Such is the message of any mere race-patriotism, of any patriotism which obliges the rest of the world to be subdued before it can receive the benefits of the pretended dispensation. Zero is the substance and the symbol of race-patriotism. All the piety and enthusiasm with which it is offered to the world, all the gun-boats and bloodshed which herald

it are powerless to raise the intellectual value of this emotion above the zero point.

*

*

*

*

*

The Germans, while they are very clever and talented, in almost every way, have in a political sense always been children. . . . Thus it happened that the most learned nation in the world has fallen quite behind the other western nations of Europe in regard to certain rudimentary political matters as, for instance, in the knowledge of how to hold meetings, make speeches, get up protests ; how to collect the men who agree with you about some matter and make their opinion prevail ; how not to vote taxes which you do not approve of ; how not to go to gaol for free speaking. The German has been at the mercy of his rulers to an extent which it is hard for an American to understand. . . .

This war has been made by the intellectuals ; the philosophy of it is a study-bred thing : like the new German bomb-shells. That philosophy of destruction, which lies beneath both the siege-guns and the pamphlets, is a tissue of super-sophistications, by which the old-time and gross passions of murder, theft, lust, hatred, and a certain nameless cruelty (which is new to the world and worse than all the rest), have been let loose on those nations which happen to live next to Germany. . . .

To recapitulate :—Germany has gone mad through dwelling on her imaginary wrongs. This came about because of the lack of political training in Germany, which left the citizen at the mercy of Government officials for his private opinions. The learned and eloquent classes thus became the tools of a military organisation. The result has been an era of panic and destructive insanity of which this war is a sign.

*

*

*

*

*

What is cultivation, and is it the same as Kultur? Are the Germans right when they say that Kultur and war go together; that Kultur breeds war and war Kultur? I am inclined to think that they are right. Kultur has always been something written in German by a man who knew one subject. It has always been a thing that came in boxes, accompanied by maps and schedules. . . . The Militarism of Kultur has always been as rigid as the Kultur of Militarism. In which of them do we find the truest essence of Germany? . . . The old Germany that rested on Luther, Kant, Goethe, and the musicians will certainly survive; it fought its way without cannon. But much of the new post-Bismarckian Kultur will fall with the epoch of race-hatred out of which it grew.

*

*

*

*

*

I confess to having experienced two distinct kinds of terror during the early months of the war; first, a fear that the things which I valued might be razed from off the earth, and second, horror at an exhibition of moral depravity such as I could not have dreamed possible in this world. Now, it makes a great deal of difference whether the cause of my terrors is a vague, immeasurable, economic race-movement which may be a permanent thing, or whether it is a temporary nervous disturbance in a well-known civilised people. . . .

Germany, then, has been suffering and causing us to suffer from the fact that she never became properly a part of the Roman Empire, but has been living in spiritual isolation since the dark ages. Her cure will come through her entry into the modern world. Her citizens will adopt the ideals of Western Europe, and will learn its forms of government and its modes of thought. This outcome will not take long. If, as I believe, the whole danger to the world has consisted in the existence of sixty millions of people who were controllable politically because they were soul-crushed

politically, then the danger is a special and a transient one. . . .

All the historic fights for liberty are really portions of one great struggle. The contentions of religious reformation, the struggles through which political democracy arose in Europe, the conflict in America about slavery, were each and all of them matters which affected the whole human family. The real issue in each struggle was always the same issue, namely, how far men may be permitted to educate and train their fellow-men in such a manner that the wills of the subjected persons are enslaved. The Germans claim a right-of-way for their system of education. The rest of the world regards that system as a menace, and therefore wars against it. . . . We, in America, are not called upon to feel indifference towards the German peril. On the contrary we must fight for the life of the world against it. But our business is to keep calm, to retain our reason. It is difficult when a fanatic is burning a church in the name of a dogma to remember that he is merely a miseducated person. We are, perhaps, obliged to shoot him ; but it makes a great difference in what spirit you shoot a man. For this treatment will control your treatment of those who are left alive.

JOSEPH H. CHOATE.

The Hon. Joseph Hodges Choate, ex-Ambassador of the United States to Great Britain (1899-1905), is a well-known American diplomatist and lawyer. He was one of the United States delegates to the Hague Conference of 1907. The following extracts are from the Introduction to Prof. J. R. Cramb's "Germany and England"; they are copyright, and are published by permission of Mr. John Murray :—

The occasion so greedily seized upon by Germany, was the refusal of Serbia to yield to the impossible ultimatum of Austria. Austria and Serbia, and the loudly proclaimed racial conflict with Slav and Serb, have already vanished from the scene and are of little account now. The real cause, as shown by Professor Cramb, is the intense hatred of Germany for England, and her lofty ambition to establish a world empire upon the ruins of the British Empire.

* * * * *

Prussia, under the lead of the Hohenzollerns, has become the master of all Germany, and, simultaneously with the humiliation of France in 1870, established the German Empire, which, however, still remains an inland empire. But all the while she has been building up, quietly but steadily, her naval and military power, so as to be ready when the hour should strike, and has succeeded in creating, in her army, a military machine of boundless numbers and of almost invincible power, to cope with and to crush, if possible, the combined forces of all the other nations of Europe.

* * * * *

But there was, and is, one insuperable obstacle in the way of this magnificent dream of a future world empire for Germany, and that is the accomplished, existing, actual world empire of Great Britain, of which England is the heart; and unless this obstacle can be removed, so that it shall never stand in the way again, the grand ideal of Germany's future can never be realised. . . .

If this be a true presentation of the contest now existing, as I believe it to be, it is truly an imperial contest between the German Empire of the future, that is to be won only by war, and this British Empire, whose chief interest now and in all the future is peace throughout the world. It is a life and death struggle between two mighty Powers, each entitled to the respect and admiration of the onlooking world.

In the last twenty years there appear to have grown up in the German mind certain ideas about England, which have no foundation in truth and which are now being tested, with a startling surprise to Germany: that the British Empire is ready to fall to pieces of its own weight and of its own age; that England, having tasted the sweets of empire, is destined to give way and Germany to have its turn; that the individual Englishman is degenerate and effeminate, softened by luxury and indulgence, and is no longer a fighter.

Thus it appears that the terrible contest is maintained on both sides, not only with equal valour and with equal vigour, but with equal conscientiousness and equally lofty motives, although the object of one is to destroy and of the other to create. The world looks on with divided sympathies, and with hope or doubt as to the result, according to such sympathies. Germany has many enemies, but England is "the enemy of enemies," the only one that counts now; and so England has many enemies, but Germany to-day is all in all among them.

44 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

Whereas Germany was led to believe that the race of the days of Cromwell and of Milton had passed away with them, it now reappears upon the scene with all its ancient courage and virtue.

*

*

*

*

*

Germany, by its gross and admitted violation of all treaties in its hostile entrance upon Belgian soil, was first in the field—but England had had full warning of what the nature of the coming contest would be, to which her Government and people might well have given more instant and constant heed.

SAMUEL HARDEN CHURCH.

Samuel Harden Church, author, soldier, and publicist, is the President of the Carnegie Institute of Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. The following extracts are from his reply (addressed through Dr. Fritz Schaper, of Berlin) to the notorious Letter of the German University Professors. It was reprinted in pamphlet form by "The Times," by whose permission we reproduce these extracts :—

Who began it? Was it England? Scarcely so, for England, in so far as her army is concerned, had yielded to the popular plea for arbitration, she was not ready for war and will not be ready for another six months. Was it France? Was it Russia? Not one of the ninety-three distinguished men who have sent me this letter, if they will read the evidence, will say so. Nominally it was Austria, who, by her unreasonable and inexorable attack on Servia, began the War, but Austria was supported, controlled and guided at every step by Germany, who, in her turn, gave notice to the powers of Europe that any interference with Austria would be resented by Germany to the full limit of war.

* * * * *

The next point in your letter reads thus: "It is not true that we trespassed in neutral Belgium." Have these ninety-three men studied well the letter they have signed? Could intellects so superbly trained deliberately certify to such an unwarranted declaration? Once again I ask, are the people of Germany being supplied with the evidence which is given to the rest of the world? Has any one of my ninety-three

46 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

honoured correspondents read the guilty statement made by Imperial Chancellor von Bethman-Hollweg in the Reichstag on August 4th? I fear not, for in that statement the Chancellor said:

“We were compelled to override the just protests of the Luxemburg and Belgian Governments. Our troops have occupied Luxemburg and perhaps are already on Belgian soil. Gentlemen, that is a breach of international law. It is true that the French Government has declared at Brussels that France is willing to respect the neutrality of Belgium, so long as her opponent respects it. France could wait, but we could not. The wrong—I speak frankly—that we are committing we will endeavour to make good as soon as our military goal has been reached.”

*

*

*

*

*

What will the good conscience of the German people say when, in spite of its passion in the rage of war, it grasps the awful significance of the confession of its Imperial Chancellor? “The wrong that we are committing.” The wreck and ruin of a country that has done you no injury, the slaughter of her sons, the expulsion of her King and Government, the blackmail of her substance, the destruction of her cities, with their happy homes, their beautiful monuments of historic times, and the priceless works of human genius!

“The wrong that we are committing.” Worst of all, when the desperate and maddened populace, seeing their sons slain and their homes in flames, fired from their windows in the last instinct of nature, your troops, with barbaric ferocity, put them to the sword without distinction of age or sex! The wrong! Oh, Doctor Schaper, if these conditions should ever be reversed and these foreign soldiers should march through the streets of Berlin, would not you, would not

all of my ninety-three correspondents, if they saw their homes battered in ruins and their sons dead in the streets, would they, too, not fire from their windows upon the merciless invaders? I am sure I would do so! When our American troops were recently dispatched to Mexico, not to conquer, not to make war, but to restore peace and good order and the authority of law, some of the people of Vera Cruz fired at them from their windows, and twenty-three of our young soldiers were killed. At last they fired back at the sharpshooters, but they did not destroy the city, nor kill the innocent, and even those among the sharpshooters who were captured were not executed, but were admonished to good behaviour, and set free. . . .

* * * * *

Your reference to German militarism brings up in my mind the conviction that this war began potentially twenty-five years ago, when Emperor William II. ascended the Throne, declared himself Supreme War Lord, and proceeded to prepare his nation for war. His own children were raised from their babyhood to consider themselves soldiers and to look forward to a destiny of slaughter; and here in America we know even his daughter only by her photograph in a colonel's uniform. And as with his own children, so all the youth of his empire were brought up. Compulsory military service made every man a soldier. I have been in Germany and have everywhere noted the lack of national tranquillity, for the streets were at all times full of soldiers; the eye caught nothing but the flash of shining helmets and polished breastplates; the ear heard nothing but the clanking of sabres and the jingling of spurs. Horses were chafing their bits and beating the air with impatient hoofs. And all this constant noise and panoply of war has poisoned the imagination of the German people, and the surging spirit of conflict has got itself into their blood.

48 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

A man wearing the Kaiser's uniform became at once a member of an exclusive class. A waiter questioning a score with a drunken officer was stabbed to the heart, the soldier's uniform making the act a good defence. A lame shoemaker, living in a conquered province, who muttered words against the Kaiser's troops, was cut down with a sabre, and the officer who committed the cowardly assault was effusively praised by the German Crown Prince. A man in humble station, who sought to greet with familiar approach a former friend now in officer's uniform, was killed for his impudence, the murderer even writing a letter to his victim's mother justifying the crime. I have myself seen German officers elbow gentle women on the street to make more room for themselves. I have seen others of them raise their glasses to the day when they would be at war.

*

*

*

*

*

Going far away from your great philosopher, Kant, who, in his Categorical Imperative, has taught us all a new golden rule, the national spirit of Germany has been fed on the sensual materialism of Nietzsche, on the undisguised bloodthirst of General von Bernhardi, on the wicked war dreams of Treitschke, and on the weak morality of von Bülow; and we behold in every scrap of evidence that we can gather from your Emperor, his children, his soldiers, his statesmen, and his professors that Germany held herself a nation apart from the rest of the world and superior to it, and predestined to maintain that superiority by war. In contrast to this narrow and destructive spirit of nationalism we in America have learned the value of humanity above the race so that we cherish all mankind in the bosom of our country.

*

*

*

*

*

And so, at last, my dear Dr. Schaper, we find ourselves shocked, ashamed, and outraged that a Christian nation should be guilty of this criminal war. There was no justification for it. Armed and defended as you were, the whole world could never have broken into your borders. And while German culture still has something to gain from her neighbours, yet the intellectual progress which Germany was making seemed to be lifting up her own people to better things for themselves and to an altruistic service to mankind. Your great nation floated its ships in every ocean, sold its wares in the uttermost parts of the earth, and enjoyed the good favour of humanity, because it was trusted as a humane State. But now all this achievement has vanished, all this good opinion has been destroyed. You cannot in half a century regain the spiritual and material benefits which you have lost. Oh, that we might have again a Germany that we could respect, a Germany of true peace, of true progress, of true culture, modest and not boastful, for ever rid of her war lords and her armed hosts, and turning once more to the uplifting influence of such leaders as Luther, Goethe, Beethoven, and Kant! But Germany, whether you win or lose in this war, has fallen, and the once glorious nation must continue to pursue its course in darkness and murder until conscience at last bids it withdraw its armies back to its own boundaries, there to hope for the world's pardon upon this inexpiable damnation.

HELEN GRAY CONE.

Miss Helen Gray Cone is Professor of English in the New York City Normal College, and has published various volumes of verse. The poem below appeared in the "Atlantic Monthly" for February, 1915, and is reprinted here by permission :—

A CHANT OF LOVE FOR ENGLAND.

A song of hate is a song of Hell ;
Some there be that sing it well.
Let them sing it loud and long,
We lift our hearts in a loftier song :
We lift our hearts to Heaven above,
Singing the glory of her we love,—
England !

Glory of thought and glory of deed,
Glory of Hampden and Runnymede ;
Glory of ships that sought far goals,
Glory of swords and glory of souls !
Glory of songs mounting as birds,
Glory immortal of magical words ;
Glory of Milton, glory of Nelson,
Tragical glory of Gordon and Scott ;
Glory of Shelley, glory of Sidney,
Glory transcendent that perishes not,—
Hers is the story, hers be the glory,
England !

Shatter her beauteous breast ye may ;
The Spirit of England none can slay !
Dash the bomb on the dome of Paul's,—

Deem ye the fame of the Admiral falls ?
Pry the stone from the chancel floor,—
Dream ye that Shakespeare shall live no more ?
Where is the giant shot that kills
Wordsworth walking the old green hills ?
Trample the red rose on the ground,—
Keats is Beauty while earth spins round !
Bind her, grind her, burn her with fire,
Cast her ashes into the sea,—
She shall escape, she shall aspire,
She shall arise to make men free ;
She shall arise in a sacred scorn,
Lighting the lives that are yet unborn ;
Spirit supernal, Splendour eternal,
ENGLAND !

RALPH ADAMS CRAM.

Ralph Adams Cram is perhaps the chief Gothic Architect in America, among the most successful of whose creations are the new buildings at West Point. He has also written several architectural and other works. The following extract appeared in a letter in the "Boston Herald" on August 31st, 1914 :—

As there are three things that thus far stand forth from the welter of fiction and misrepresentation as damnable and undenied—the violation of Belgian neutrality, the attempt to murder King Albert, his wife and children by Zeppelins manœuvring over the palace in Antwerp, and the annihilation of Louvain—so there are three things that stand gloriously and immortally to the front to restore our falling confidence in modern civilisation—Belgium's epic and tragical defence of her neutrality, Great Britain's uprising in the cause of honour amongst nations, and the lightning-like abandonment of contention between Catholic Ireland and Protestant Ulster, and their eager support of King George in a war that was none of his seeking.

Whatever the history of this war may be, whatever it reveals of heroism and self-abnegation, and courage that crests over Thermopylæ and Balaklava, nothing can dim the imperishable glory already won by Belgium, and whatever her fate, her name will be remembered forever as that of a knightly people that gave everything in the cause of honour and of right. And yet England presses her hard ; each could easily have torn in pieces "the little scrap of paper" (a phrase always to be remembered as the synonym of that

sinister and Macchiavellian diplomacy that lies at the root of the stupendous crime) and so saved unnumbered thousands of lives, unnumbered billions of money; but, thank God, each remembered that "Who saveth his life shall lose it," and England hesitated no longer than Belgium.

Once Austria declared war against Servia, Russia and France had no alternative; for them the die was cast, and they are heroically playing their part; but it was different in the case of Great Britain. She could keep out, but as this would be at the cost of honour, she came in, and in so doing she claims and will receive the moral support of the whole United States and the physical support also, should this be necessary to save her and her allies and the cause of civilisation from that ominous force that expresses itself in the violation of Belgian neutrality, the attempt on the lives of the Belgian royal house and the sack of Louvain.

RICHARD HARDING DAVIS.

Richard Harding Davis, novelist, playwright, and journalist, served during the earlier stages of the war as War Correspondent of the Wheeler Syndicate of Newspapers and the London "Daily Chronicle." He collected his experiences in a book entitled "With the Allies," from which the first four of the following paragraphs are taken by permission of the publishers, Messrs. Duckworth & Co. The remaining paragraphs are from a letter contributed by Mr. Davis to "The Sun" (N.Y.) on Feb. 22nd, 1915 :—

Were the conflict in Europe a fair fight, the duty of every American would be to keep on the side-lines and preserve an open mind. But it is not a fair fight. To devastate a country you have sworn to protect, to drop bombs upon unfortified cities, to lay sunken mines, to levy blackmail by threatening hostages with death, to destroy cathedrals, is not to fight fair.

That is the way Germany is fighting. She is defying the rules of war and the rules of humanity. And if public opinion is to help in preventing further outrages, and in hastening this unspeakable conflict to an end, it should be directed against the one who offends. If we are convinced that one opponent is fighting honestly, and that his adversary is striking below the belt, then for us to maintain a neutral attitude of mind is unworthy and the attitude of a coward.

When a mad dog runs amuck in a village, it is the duty of every farmer to get his gun and destroy it, not to lock himself indoors and toward the dog and the men who face him preserve a neutral mind. . . .

Englishmen are coming out of this war better men, not because they have been taught the manual

of arms, but in spite of that fact. What they have learned is much more than that. Each of them has, for an ideal, whether you call it a flag, or a king, or a geographical position on the map, offered his life, and for that ideal has trained his body and sacrificed his pleasures, and each of them is the better for it. And when peace comes his country will be the richer and the more powerful.

*

*

*

*

*

Long ago, when the Germans invaded neutral Belgium, burned Louvain, shot the citizens, and with threats of hanging the hostages they had taken levied ransom, the whole world exclaimed, "But they can't do that! It's against the Declaration of This and the Treaty of That and the Conference of the Other Place; it's against international law and the usages of polite society and civilised peoples. They can't do it!"

In answer the Germans shelled the Cathedral at Rheims, from which Red Cross flags were flying; incidentally killing some of their own wounded.

"But they can't fire on sacred edifices," the civilised world explained, "nor on the Red Cross!" And the Pope told them they could not do that, and architects, historians, art lovers over all the world told them.

So the Germans sent airships over Paris and her monuments and art treasures and dropped a bomb on a lawyer and a little girl. The bomb tore off the leg of the little girl. When in the hospital she became conscious, she said, "Don't tell my mother how serious it is!" They sent Zeppelins over Pont-à-Mousson and Nancy, killing more children, and then with that thoroughness for which their General Staff is celebrated and that there might not be more children to confront them later, at Remiremont dropped a bomb on the Maternity Hospital.

And the civilised world said, "But you agreed not to

56 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

drop bombs on unfortified places. So you can't do that."

And in answer the Germans sent warships to bombard the watering place of Scarborough. At Scarborough the only forts are those the children build in the sand. It is as though they had shelled Atlantic City or Long Branch. In one group in a playground they killed fourteen schoolboys and elsewhere several babies. It was a record bag. But the world was very indignant and pointed out that they could not do that, and by international law and treaties and scraps of paper proved they could not do that.

But this indignation was not expressed in Germany.

So in consequence Germany sent submarines into neutral waters to destroy neutral merchant ships. And again among themselves the neutral Powers spoke with indignation. "They can't do that!" they exclaimed. "They cannot sink non-combatant captains, and stokers, and innocent passengers!"

And in answer on the 18th and 20th of this month Germany sank three neutral merchant ships. Out of the water a periscope raised its head and while in terror the clumsy freight steamer reversed her engines the torpedo tore into her bowels. The submarine sank to rise another day, and the neutral steamer also sank but not to rise again.

The crime of the neutral Powers and the civilised peoples is that at the first outrage perpetrated by Germany they remained silent. The individual protested. From platforms, in editorials, in Congress, he made himself heard. But no individual, no matter how just may be his indignation, can communicate that indignation to the German Emperor. His Government must do that for him. And as no Government had the courage to protest, to speak sharply, to brandish the "big stick," Germany exclaimed, "We have a free hand!" And from bad hastened to worse.

From the moment she broke her word and entered

the neutral territory of Belgium the rights of every neutral were in jeopardy. The man who is false to one will be false to another. But the neutral Powers could not see that. Belgium seemed so far away. And in the United States we were so entirely surrounded by water, so comfortably safe. So, although as joint signers of the agreement made at The Hague it was our privilege and duty to protest, we said nothing. Nor did any other neutral. And emboldened by the silence Germany one after another broke all the rules of war.

All war is wasteful, unintelligent, indecent. But steadily for several hundred years the effort has been to make it less inhuman, to limit the death and suffering it entails to the actual combatants. The effort has been to get away from the days of the Huns, who sacked, looted, and raped; from the days of our Indians, who burned villages; from the ethics of Raisuli, the Moorish bandit, and the Mexican cattle thieves, who with threats of death hold up non-combatants for money. But to the days of these outrages Germany has returned.

Instead of neutrals setting the standard for war they allowed Germany to set it. They have allowed her to drag it back eight hundred years. And guilty as she is, I cannot see that those who stood by while Belgium was desolated and children and women killed by bombs and mines were spread in the open sea that belonged to all of them are not equally guilty.

If you go to a fight at the Garden and one of the men strikes below the belt, you will hear from several thousand spectators. The spectator is in no danger. No one is hitting him. He is comfortably, safely seated far from the combat, smoking a cigar. But still he yells "Foul!" and threatens the referee. Why? Because he is in danger? No, because he desires fair play and insists that the rules of the game be respected.

If, at the start of this war, our Government and

58 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

those of South America, Italy, Spain, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, and Switzerland had jointly protested to Germany against the outrages she committed, against her breaking all the rules of civilised warfare, they might not only have prevented the destruction of lives and of cities, but even might have brought the war to a close.

CHARLES WILLIAM ELIOT.

Charles William Eliot, LL.D., President of Harvard University from 1869 to 1909, member of numerous learned bodies, and holder of several foreign Orders, is perhaps the leading educational authority in the United States of America. The following extracts are collected from the various sources indicated :—

From an address on *America's Duty in Relation to the European War*, at the Boston Business Women's Club, on October 15th, 1914 :

We have been startled by the outbreak, the apparently sudden outbreak, of the worst fighting that the world has ever seen in regard to destruction of life and property, and of precious treasures of letters and art. That is the literal fact. No war of former times has been so destructive of things that we imagined the human race in its civilised parts held to be precious and inviolable.

Then, most Americans believed that one of the chief methods of progress in civilisation was expressed in the phrase, "the sanctity of contracts." You are all business women. You have known that modern business absolutely depends on the sanctity of contracts. It depends also upon the faith of man in man. All the commercial and financial agencies of the modern world are built on credit ; and what is credit but the faith of man in man that all will observe the sanctity of a contract or agreement ? . . .

Suddenly we find a strong nation which claims the highest degree of civilisation absolutely disregarding all considerations of chivalrous action towards weaker powers. The attack by Germany on Belgium was a violent attack of a sudden on an army and a

nation that was indefinitely weaker than Germany—no comparison whatever between little Belgium and great Germany in any sort of power or force ; and to-day Belgium has been devoured, is extinct, if Europe shall permit her to be extinguished.

We had hoped that the methods of war and the ethics of war had been shown to be capable of amelioration, of improvement. Both Conferences of The Hague laboured much over ameliorations of the practices in war. This present war has blown all those efforts to the winds. . . .

The prevailing German philosophy of government and of national greatness is built upon the dogma—" Might makes Right." It seems to be a new religion among the leading Prussians that force is the only basis of national greatness and of moral dignity, and valour the highest virtue, no matter in what cause valour is displayed. . . . Do you believe that might makes right ? Have you ever believed it ? . . . Here in this most fortunate and blessed country we have had a totally different conception of right relations between man and woman, between adults and children, between the State and its citizens. We absolutely deny that might makes right. We believe that the foundations of the family and of the State are moral, and that these moral foundations have superseded in some measure the ancient tenet that the strong have the right to dominate the weak. . . .

Our neutrality is official or legal, as it were. It must be maintained until new conditions determine new actions. But it is, of course, quite impossible for us to be neutral as regards our feelings and beliefs, our sentiments and hopes ; quite impossible, because the cause in which Germany and Austria-Hungary are fighting is the cause of imperialism, of militarism, of government by force, using against other nations the extreme of skilfully-directed, highly-trained force. We see upon the other side the two freest large nations

AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR 61

in Europe combined with a military empire. These two freest nations—England and France—are nations to which we of this country are deeply indebted for our own safety, freedom, and faith in liberty under law. Therefore, neutrality in our hearts is quite out of the question. . . .

We must not accept the German view that this war is really waged to resist a new irruption of the barbarians into Europe. It is more than doubtful whether the Russians are barbarians. It is more than doubtful whether the spirit in which the Russians are now fighting be not more accordant with the American spirit than the spirit which animates the German Empire. . . .

We must hope and pray that we shall not be drawn into this most horrible war of all time. But that escape will be due to the fact that Russia, England, and France have succeeded in defeating Germany and Austria-Hungary. . . .

Let us not confuse our minds and wills by failing to see whither the German policies lead, whither the teachings of Bismarck, Treitschke, and Bernhardi have led Germany. Let us not dream of abandoning our faith that human relations should be, nay, shall be, determined, not by arrogant force, but by considerations of justice, mercy, love, and good will.

From an address on *National Efficiency Best Developed under Free Government*, at the Harvard Club, January 15th, 1915:

The government of Germany is the most autocratic in Europe. A friend writes, "We Germans are just as free as you Americans." That belief, unanimous in Germany, is a complete demonstration of the autocratic character of the government. They do not know what liberty is. They have no imagination of such liberty as we enjoy. They know nothing about the liberty England has won through parliamentary

62 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

government. Their complete ignorance is really the reason for the fatal mistake the German Government made in going to war before they knew what England would do. And their violation of Belgian territory was largely because they did not know how a free people regard the sanctity of a treaty.

This war develops more and more as a conflict between free and autocratic institutions, shrouded or complicated as that fact is by the participation of Russia with the Allies. If this is the real issue German efficiency becomes a very interesting question, for the result will turn not on mere numbers, but on efficiency. German efficiency is an efficiency in administration. It takes hold of every child at birth and follows the youth, the man and the woman till death. It is an autocratic efficiency in the highest degree in all walks of human life, including education. . . .

We may reasonably conclude, therefore, that there is a power in free institutions, with the immense reinforcements they get from free corporate management, which leads straight to efficiency in the management of the industries of a country, and in the management of its governmental concerns, and which in the long run will be a higher efficiency than any despotic or autocratic government can develop. We may hope, we may confidently expect, that an efficiency in the conduct of this war will be developed by England and France which is superior to the efficiency of Germany, and that is my ground for being confident of the issue of this war.

From an Article in *The New York Times*:

Be efficient, be virile, be hard, be bloody, be rulers, worship according to the rites of the religion of valour, adopt the dogma that might makes right, teach the individual that he must sacrifice life, liberty, everything to the State, ride down and trample upon whoever stands in the way of imperial progress along

AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR 63

the bloody road—this is the creed of Germany, this is its theory and practice of the State's duty to itself, this is the use made of the power it has by the ruthless sacrifice of finer things built up.

To maintain that the Power which has adopted in practice that new morality, and in accordance with its precepts promised Austria its support against Serbia, and invaded Belgium and France in hot haste, is not the responsible author of the European war, is to throw away memory, reason, and common sense in judging the human agencies in current events.

From a Letter to the Editor of the *Boston Herald* :

The twentieth-century educated German is, however, by no means given over completely to material and physical aggrandisement and the worship of might. He cherishes a partly new conception of the State as a collective entity whose function is to develop and multiply, not the free, healthy and happy individual man and woman, but higher and more effective types of humanity, made superior by a strenuous discipline which takes much account of the strong and ambitious, and little of the weak or meek. He rejects the ethics of the Beatitudes as unsound, but accepts the religion of valour, which exalts strength, courage, endurance and the ready sacrifice by the individual of liberty, happiness and life itself, for Germany's honour and greatness. A nation of 60,000,000 holding these philosophical and religious views, and proposing to act on them in winning by force the empire of the world, threatens civilisation with more formidable irruptions of a destroying host than any that history has recorded. The rush of the German army into Belgium, France and Russia and its consequences to those lands have taught the rest of Europe to dread German domination, and—it is to be hoped—to make it impossible.

The real cause of the present convulsion is,

64 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

then, the state of mind or temper of Germany, including her conception of national greatness, her theory of the state and her intelligent and skilful use of all the forces of nineteenth-century applied science for the destructive purposes of war. It is therefore apparent that Europe can escape from the domination of Germany only by defeating her in her present undertakings; and that this defeat can be brought about only by using against her the same effective agencies of destruction and the same martial spirit on which Germany itself relies. . . .

The immediate duty of the United States is presumably to prepare, on the basis of its present army and navy, to furnish an effective quota of the international force, servant of an international tribunal, which will make the ultimate issue of this most abominable of wars, not a truce, but a durable peace.

In the meantime, the American peoples cry with one voice to the German people, like Ezekiel to the House of Israel: "Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die." . . .

From an Address at the Annual Pilgrims' Meeting, at the Whitehall Club, New York, towards the end of February, 1915:

My writings on the war have brought many letters that asked: "Are you an Englishman?" "Where were you born?" "How much does England pay you?" "What does America owe to England?"

These questions I have had to answer over and over again, and so I have had to think about what we owe to England. We owe to England all the early practice of liberty; we owe to England the teachings of John Milton about civil and religious liberty; and we are looking to her now for something only England can give. That is a complete demonstration that national efficiency can be developed to a higher expression under free institutions than it can under autocratic institutions.

JOSEPH C. FRALEY.

Joseph C. Fraley, a lawyer of Philadelphia, has published a pamphlet, "How and Why a War Lord Wages War," from which we quote the following paragraph :—

We know that the one hope of stopping wars is to supply a world-wide sanction for the support of international laws and morals. We have nothing to do with the reasons which led certain Powers to engage that Belgian territory should be neutral in time of war. We have everything to do with this particular instance of treaty-breaking, in that it constitutes a new departure, a crime against all neutrals. Treaties made for peace conditions are obviously liable to be broken in war ; but a treaty made with special reference to war belongs to that class of obligations whose infringement is like cheating at cards. The offender gets no second chance.

JOHN CLINTON GRAY.

The Hon. John Clinton Gray was an Associate Judge of the High Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New York from 1888 to 1913. The extracts are from a private letter of September 7th, 1914 :—

I had read attentively and appreciatively the "White Paper" to which you direct my attention in your note. I thank you for doing so, however. . . . It seems to me that no candid mind can read and consider the correspondence relative to the European crisis without reaching the conclusion that Germany intentionally laid the train whereby the general war resulted. In every organisation and in arms she had prepared herself while professing to seek a peaceful solution. It was a great shock to me, for my knowledge of Germans and their aims had led me to suppose that the Emperor was sincere in his desire for the peaceful agreement of great nations, and that the civilisation of the people made them averse from war and its horrors.

* * * * *

I have finished reading the book you gave me, "Great Britain's Case." It is an interesting publication ; in presenting the views of the Oxford professors upon the war, as in its giving a compendium of the historical facts necessary to the formation of a rational judgment as to where rests the responsibility for a war that is devastating some of the fairest and happiest portions of Europe.

It is a saddening, but, to me, inevitable, reflection

that this disastrous conflict between great nations had its "motif" in the desire, at a supposed opportune moment, to extend the dynastic domination of the Hohenzollerns, and that it is not waged in support of any justifiable principle. An unnecessary war, it was preached and expected by those who were militarists in government; it was allowed to become general through deceit and misrepresentation; it appears to have been conducted by the Germans with the instincts of vandals; and their success means, not only the disturbance of the political equilibrium, so essential to the peace and progress of the civilised world, but, I think, also the repression of those equitable and liberal principles of government which best give effect to the just wishes of the people. Is it not a maddening thought that at this day, without a definite grievance, it could be possible for a ruler to plunge his country into war, and to involve it, with other nations, in debt and distress! The fight must go on to a finish; for the contest can never be given up until the German armies are not only defeated and driven back, but, also, such measures of repression taken, and such safeguards established as will, in the future, make German aims and policies, as inculcated by Nietzsche, Bernhardi, and others of that ilk, impossible of fruition.

An intelligent consideration of the English and German official publications (White Papers) must make it clear to the reader that Germany intended that the Austro-Serbian incident should not be the subject of mediation nor a war therefrom localised. It was to furnish an excuse for a war with France and Russia. Two, obvious, reasons for this conclusion suffice. Germany refused to come into the conference proposed by Sir Edward Grey, in his desire to prevent the general conflagration he foresaw as the outcome of a war with Serbia; or so, purposely, delayed over the matter as to make it too late to confer. Then, Germany issued its ultimatum to Russia when the Russian

68 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

and Austrian Cabinets were willing to resume their discussion. And, when the principals in the affair were still willing to consider, why should Germany, herself not interested in the question in dispute, seek to precipitate a conflict by sending such an imperious ultimatum to Russia? (German Paper, p. 24.) Russia would not comply with such a demand for *general* demobilisation, and Austria was placed in a position where she had to cease discussion and declare for war. The German White Paper is but an argument which is completely answered by the reading of the official documents; having care to compare the dates. The verdict of dispassionate minds, I am confident, will be that Germany, prepared for war, and intending to violently extend her territory and to widen her domination, was awaiting the opportune moment, and, believing it had come, with an excuse which could be made to do service, deliberately refused to use her unquestionable influence with Austria, either for mediation, or for the localisation of the war; marched her troops by a "short cut" through Belgium, in violation of her treaty, and revenged herself for the delay caused by that country's heroic resistance by acts of cruelty and of destruction, of which a civilised nation should be deemed incapable. The die is cast, and, fortunately, perhaps, for the world, the Germans have mistaken their moment and have forced the issue when the three great Powers antagonised were in accord, and, by uniting their strength, are able to meet, and to end, the German menace.

I have inflicted upon you a long letter, and have said, of course, nothing that has not occurred to your clear mind; but I was worked up after reading, and you must bear the brunt of my thoughts.

WILLIAM GRAHAM HALE.

William Graham Hale is Professor and Head of the Department of Latin in the University of Chicago. The following extracts are from an article contributed to the "New York Tribune" on November 10th, 1914 :—

This is no small quarrel. The fate of the world hangs upon it. That which we ought some day to do we should do now ; should have done already. Technical reasons, as well as moral reasons, we have in abundance. . . . Even if we did not make war, it was our duty at the very least to address a temperate protest to Germany. We did not protest. The love of fair play is inherent in the Anglo-Saxon race, as well as in most others. Even a crowd at a prize-fight or a game will not tolerate repeated and deliberate foul play, and wait to the end in the hope of adjudication. It will promptly drag the offending party out of the ring. But we do nothing.

We are not a military nation, and are not prepared. But our navy could at once have patrolled the seas, and given security in the Atlantic. We could have kept the communications between France and England open. We could have guarded the English harbours. We could have set the English fleet entirely free to do its most important work, if it is in any way possible to do it—namely, to destroy the German navy. That once gone, Germany could never have built another until after peace was declared. She would have been heavily crippled. A declaration of war from us would also have at once shut off all American food from reaching Germany by any channel. We could also

have sent at once a small army to the field. There was a time when a small additional force would have made a difference. We could have asked for volunteers. Hundreds and thousands would have offered themselves. We were not prepared, but Germany would have known that we were preparing. She would have seen that her cause was hopeless.

* * * * *

The victory of Germany and Austria would mean a Germanised and bureaucratically controlled England, France, Russia, and Italy ; for Italy would not survive. It would be a world intolerable to live in, and intolerable for an American to think about. But thinking about it is not the only thing that he would suffer.

The victory of Germany would put at her disposal an enormous fleet, consisting of all the ships that survived the war. Her ambition would not be sated. She aims at nothing less than world dominion. *Deutschland über alles* does not mean "with the exception of the United States." She has known how to attack us. The moment she had a trained German personnel for her immense navy, South America, or as much as she wanted of it from time to time, would become a German colony. The nucleus already exists in Brazil, and could easily enough produce an excuse for war if one was thought desirable for historical purposes. To the winds would go the Monroe Doctrine and South American freedom. We, with our then relatively tiny navy, should be helpless, either to keep Germany off or to dislodge her. From South America she would strike at us. Our coasts would be at her mercy, and she could land her disciplined troops anywhere. The country would be full of spies, as France and Belgium are to-day. We should fight desperately, and our land is of great extent. But only disciplined armies can prevail in these times. Guerilla warfare is useless. Fighting would be done here by railroads

and the reduction of great centres. The population of Germany and Austria is to-day larger than ours by some sixteen millions ; and Germany, then the mistress of Europe, could safely bring an army into the field from many quarters, both of Europe and South America. The struggle would be bitter. We should have the advantage in distance ; but the ocean is narrow to-day as the presence of soldiers from all parts of the world on the battlefields of France has shown us. And Germany would have every other possible start upon us.

This is no idle speculation. It is no more a nightmare than was the possibility of a Germanised Europe a few months ago. We should stop it all by throwing our strength now upon the side of the Allies.

HENRY NOBLE HALL.

Henry Noble Hall, Staff Correspondent of "The World" (New York), contributed an article on "Kitchener's Army" to "The Field" for February 6th, 1915. The following paragraphs are quoted from this article by permission of the Editor of "The Field":—

Aldershot, January 21st.—They call it Kitchener's army, but what I have seen is something far greater than an army. It is a Democracy in arms. Here are the village blacksmith and the village parson, the squire's son and the young farmer, the miner and the mechanic, the factory hand and the city clerk, the artisan and the college graduate, the business man and the doctor, the lawyer and the tradesman. This man was a stockbroker, this other waited at table, or measured tape, or washed dishes. They have come, of their own free will, from cottage and castle, to offer their lives to their country, for they know that England's cause is just.

These are the men who are going to crush militarism, and when the task is accomplished those who are left will lay aside their khaki and their guns and go back to work just as quietly as they came. "Yes," you will say, "but what kind of soldiers do they make?" The answer is—and I am understating the truth—they are equal to the finest regular troops that England has ever put in the field at any period of her history. That is not the snap judgment of a newspaperman; it is the deliberate opinion of professional soldiers, of white-haired Generals who have fought in or seen every war in the last half century.

And you do not have to be in Aldershot long to

realise that Kitchener's army is as clean-lipped as it is clean-limbed. That these men can be turned loose on to Germany without fear of their doing anything that will tarnish their country's name. They will outrage no women, and plunder no property, nor will they set houses on fire except as military necessity dictates. But God pity the men who have to face them with arms in their hands. For these are not the men to ask quarter, and I do not think that they will give it. The more I saw of Kitchener's army the stronger my impression grew that this is something far greater than any army. I have seen but a tiny portion of it, and astonishment has given way to admiration, admiration to pride, and pride to awe. Truly this is a Democracy in arms. Men who have the same love of liberty and the same respect for law as millions of other men in the United States. They have laid aside each one his work for a brief space, and have taken arms to defend the weak against the strong, to drive the invader from wasted Belgium, to crush Prussian militarism. Never crusader knelt in prayer before leaving for the Holy Land more convinced in the righteousness of his cause than are these men. Theirs is the spirit of 1776, and they will beat the Germans to-morrow just as surely as the American colonists beat the Hessian troops sent against them when Englishmen could not be found to force Autocracy upon the thirteen States. But one thing is certain, and that is that when Kitchener's army takes the field it will be as if another nation had entered the conflict upon the side of the Allies.

GEORGE McLEAN HARPER.

George McLean Harper, Ph.D., Professor of English Literature at the University of Princeton, and author of various books, contributed the following letter to the "New York Times" :—

It is a pity there are so few Americans in England at present. Our countrymen are always welcome enough here and are never regarded as foreigners. Little as ordinary Englishmen know about our politics or our geography, they know infinitely more about our minds and hearts than the peoples of the Continent. They have been wont to give us a friendly preference and an uncommon hospitality. But the war has shown that there exists in England something even more gratifying to our pride than a disposition to treat us pleasantly. It has revealed a general trust in our fairness and our willingness to make sacrifices for what we believe to be right. I have not discovered any marked tendency to flatter. That is not one of the English weaknesses. But a nation in trouble, looking round for another nation capable of appreciating her motives, her sorrow, and her sources of moral strength, turns with a brightening countenance toward the West and says to herself, "The American people understand."

That is why I am sorry there are so few Americans in England now. For if ever we who are here had reason to feel proud of our country it is when this respect is being paid to her by those whose good opinion Americans have always valued most highly. From Hyde Park to St. Paul's the flags of the Allies have fluttered and faded in the winter rain along the

two great thoroughfares of London, and among them, here and there, the Stars and Stripes. *I do not say that Englishmen really think the United States ought to enter the alliance. But they evidently rely on our understanding them ; and I sometimes ask myself : What if they are mistaken ? What if commercial instincts and interests and a narrow " patriotism " have made us, after all, incapable of the generous sympathy which we are credited with possessing ? Do the English rate too high our good sense and good feeling ?* They attribute to us a strong dislike for militarism and a high degree of penetration. They say that we, of all people, are least likely to overlook the gross and palpable facts that Germany planned the war, seized her opportunity, and violated Belgian neutrality, which Great Britain was bound by treaty to defend. No German afterthoughts should be allowed to overlies these fundamental facts. If it was a crime for Russia to mobilise last July it was a crime for Germany to have built strategic railroads and laid detailed plans of invasion months and years before. Britain certainly was not prepared. She has plenty of recruits, but confessedly not enough uniforms to clothe them nor enough rifles to arm them. I see companies and battalions almost every day which for weeks have been drilling in civilian dress and without weapons. They are in splendid physical condition and know the manual of arms, but are still as defenceless as flocks of sheep.

As they march they sing our old battle hymn, " Glory, Glory, Hallelujah ! " and an American onlooker feels that they are not merely of the same blood as most of us, but related to us as no foreigners can be—by language, morals, manners, laws, and outlook on life. Indeed, they are more like us than we are like ourselves, more like the " typical American " whom we have idealised, the old-fashioned kind of long ago. They remind me of Cooper's heroes and the men of Valley Forge—quiet, undemonstrative, grimly resolved.

76 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

In physical appearance, with their high noses, straight backs, and long legs, the men of Kitchener's Army recall the pictures of Washington's men.

I have been much impressed with the almost complete absence of expressions of hatred against the enemy. Even the indiscriminate slaughter of women and children at Scarborough and Hartlepool has not provoked a spirit of vindictiveness in this well-balanced and self-restrained race. I was in Italy after the campaign in Abyssinia, and remember that the blank walls were covered with scurrilous writing. I have heard Germans denounce France, and Frenchmen rave against the "barbarians." But the English do not unpack their hearts with words. Mothers and fathers tell me calmly that their sons have enlisted. "It is terrible," they say, "but England could do no less." And I should be a monster of cynicism did I not believe them sincere. The English people and their Government did not want war and did not expect it. This increasingly democratic country, at the moment when it was applying itself more than ever to the problems of social and political justice, when it had made South Africa virtually an independent nation and granted the demands of Ireland, and was providing for the future of working men, found itself obliged to stand by its solemn pledges and defend not only Belgium but the world against an unprovoked attack. And that the sacrifice should be made so calmly, so completely, and with so little evidence of bad temper should, I think, appeal to Americans who cherish the same ideals. We have far more cause for intervention in behalf of the Allies than we had for the war of 1812, or the Mexican War, or the Spanish War. But apart from intervention there is much that we can do to shorten this agony. We can be patient when friction occurs between our Government and that of Great Britain over maritime difficulties. We can as individuals abstain from trading directly or indirectly

with Germany. It is absurd to suppose that anybody who is not a cold-blooded egoist can really be neutral. Official neutrality may be maintained ; but the soul is free, and surely the soul of America is not so recreant to the ancient principles of liberty and justice as to withhold at least moral support from those who, in the British Isles and in France, are giving up all they possess to defend the right.

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.

Albert Bushnell Hart, LL.D., Professor of History and Government at Harvard University since 1887, author of a number of historical works, and editor of "American History Told by Contemporaries" and "The American Nation," contributed an article to the "New York Times" of December 27th on "The Essential Points of Belgian Neutrality." The following extracts are taken (by permission) from this article :—

The object of this article is to set forth the things that have actually been done, or neglected, from the first treaty of Belgian neutrality in 1831 down to the forcible occupation of Belgium by a German army in 1914. The most important groups of facts upon this question allow answers to the following inquiries: (1) What is neutralisation? (2) How did Belgium become neutralised? (3) What has been the attitude of the other Powers to Belgian neutrality? (4) Did the Belgians observe neutrality down to July, 1914? (5) Did the Belgians observe neutrality during the outbreak of the war? (6) How was Belgian neutrality terminated? (7) Were the neutralisation treaties still binding on August 4th, 1914? (8) Was the German invasion a breach of good morals? (9) Has the United States any responsibilities in the matter?

* * * * *

If no neutralisation treaty or Hague Conventions had ever been signed, the right of such Powers as Italy, the United States and Belgium to remain neutral, and to take no part on either side in the present war, would have been precisely as strong as it is now. A

State is entitled to be neutral simply because it is neutral ; and a refusal to take part with either side in the war is friendly to all parties and hostile to none. A refreshing effort has been made to prove that Germany had a right to attack the neutralised State of Belgium because as a signatory Power to the treaty of neutrality it could claim especial fidelity from Belgium. That argument seems to lead to the preposterous deduction that where Germany has made a specific promise to respect neutrality she has a peculiar right to violate that neutrality ; but where she had made no such pledge it would have been very wrong to override neutrality.

* * * * *

Anyone who reads the whole debate in " Hansard " will see that Gladstone's position was substantially the following : (a) A change of circumstances does not entitle a Power to invade a neutralised country in the guaranty of which it has previously joined. (b) A change of circumstances may justify another guarantor refraining from war if its only grievance is the disregard of neutrality by another guarantor. (c) This being the case, England will make a positive agreement to fight for the protection of Belgium if either France or Prussia should invade it.

In 1872 the treaty of 1870 expired and that of 1839 again came into force.

* * * * *

These apprehensions led Belgium to use her treaty right to construct fortifications at Liége and Namur ; and in 1909 she took steps to build up a small but efficient army. It was impossible for the Belgians not to take special notice of the network of strategic railroads which the Germans were constructing along the frontier between the two countries.

Nevertheless, the goodwill of Germany was several

times expressed. (a) In 1911, Bethmann-Hollweg, the German Chancellor, assured the Belgians that Germany had no designs on their neutrality, and the German Minister to Belgium, von Flotow, made a similar assurance. (b) In 1913, von Jagow, the German Foreign Secretary, made a public statement in the Budget Committee of the Reichstag to the same general effect. (c) As late as July 31st, 1914, the German Minister in Brussels expressed to the Belgian Government his confidence that, if war broke out, Belgium would not be invaded by Germany.

Evidently, whenever Belgium felt that any of her big neighbours was looking enviously at the strategic acres of the prosperous little kingdom, she turned for consolation to some of her other international god-fathers and always found it.

* * * *

In 1906 a Belgian officer filed a memorandum of conversations between Colonel Barnardiston, representative of the English General Staff, and the Belgian authorities, as to what common military measures should be undertaken if the necessity came. The memorandum clearly shows those things that show the observance of their neutrality by the Belgians. (a) No treaty or other signed document was found. (b) The British Government has categorically denied that any binding understanding was reached. (c) The memorandum includes the clause: "The entry of the English into Belgium would only take place after the violation of our neutrality by Germany." In any case such a conversation cannot possibly be construed to be a breach of neutrality.

* * * *

Since, up to July, 1914, the German Government, with its marvellous intelligence system, has not given

public warning of an unneutral spirit in Belgium, the only sane conclusion is that the German Government up to July, 1914, accepted Belgian neutrality as an obligation honestly kept by its smaller neighbour.

* * * * *

The only official reason stated by the German Government for its action at the time was its belief that the French were about to invade Belgium, which now appears to have been very improbable. There were no charges against Belgium of unneutral acts of any sort. In fact the point of view of the German Government was simply that it had made up its mind to march through Belgium, and that the Belgian people could do nothing but yield. The Germans asked for "a friendly attitude," and promised not to injure Belgium permanently. The sole question considered by the Germans seems to have been whether such a step would be for their military advantage. The responsible spokesman for Germany, Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg, in his speech to the Reichstag (August 4th) disdained to throw the responsibility upon the Belgians. An honest man, determined to tell a disagreeable truth at a great crisis, he said :

"Gentlemen, that is contrary to the dictates of international law. . . . We were compelled to override the just protests of the Luxemburg and Belgian Governments ; the wrong—I speak openly—that we are committing we will endeavour to make good as soon as our military goal has been reached."

The Foreign Minister, von Jagow, said to Goschen : "It is a matter of life and death." If it was a "matter of life and death" to the Germans, it was equally a matter of death and life to the Belgians.

* * * * *

82 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

The pamphlet, "The Truth About Germany," asserts that :

"Belgium protested, at the same time allowing, by an agreement with France, that the French troops might enter Belgium. After all this, and not till France and Belgium, itself, had broken the neutrality, our troops entered the neutral territory."

This statement is made over the signatures of Prince von Bülow, Field Marshal von der Goltz, Prof. Harnack, and other men of weight and honour, whose testimony as to things they know from their own knowledge would be unhesitatingly accepted ; but it flatly collides with the significant dates. August 1st the French Government notified the British Government and the Belgians that it would not enter Belgium so long as its adversaries kept out ; on August 3rd the French Minister to Belgium offered the aid of France, which was for the time declined ; and before any further steps could be taken Germany entered Belgium, August 4th. Just where in this interval the agreement could have been made with France it is impossible to discover.

What is the net result of the examination of these charges ? The only one which was stated at the time by German officials is that relating to the grain cargoes, which was lost sight of in a few hours. No authentic signed official statements have been laid before the American public in confirmation of any other charge. Some unofficial writers still insist that the reason why no such proofs have been communicated is that the English have seized upon the telegraphic communication of the world.

It is high time to drop that threadbare excuse. Nobody doubts that Count Bernstorff has for weeks been in almost daily communication with his Government. Mails have been coming regularly from Germany

ever since September 1st, as thousands of people who have German friends can testify. The indispensable documentary proof would have been furnished and published in the columns of *The New York Times* and elsewhere if it existed. The German Government is incapable of manufacturing evidence, and has wisely declined to take the stand that Belgium was invaded because the Belgians gave cause for war.

* * * * *

The most significant effect of the German action is to alarm the rest of the world by the apparent acceptance of the principle that the sole measure of what is allowable in war is military necessity (which means simply military advantage) for a powerful nation. If Germany, with her tradition of suffering, can feel it right to enter upon and destroy a neighbouring nation for the avowed reason that its territory is desirable for carrying on war against a third nation, there is no great Power which can be trusted. Perhaps, France or Great Britain might, under temptation, act with similar defiance of the rights of other Powers. We cannot be sure what they would have done had Belgium been a convenient military approach for them. Nevertheless, we are absolutely sure what the Germans would have done to Belgium, or any other nation that stood in their way, because it would be precisely what Germany has done to Belgium. The greatness, the power, the moral strength of Germany, its acknowledged intellectual and commercial strength, were all reasons for holding back from a step which brought little military advantage and desperately wounded the warmest friends of Germany in other lands.

* * * * *

Still it is a fair question whether it was not the duty of every signatory, including the United States,

to lodge a protest when the Germans moved into Belgium. A serious difficulty is that ten of the other signatory powers are belligerents, and most of them are themselves encroaching every day upon some provision of the Hague Conventions. It does not appear to be the duty of the United States to stand forth as the one defender of a peace which has so lamentably failed ; and a paper declaration that the United States believed Germany to have acted in bad faith could not legally establish such a charge without an investigation of the facts, which is impossible in time of war.

The United States is nowise bound to send military aid to the Belgians, or to any other belligerent who may in the end get the worst in the struggle. First, because we have not troops enough to defend our own coast from a powerful and resolute adversary ; and, second, because the great duty of the United States is to show that a world war is unnecessary, that there is still one high-powered neutral.

The people of the United States, if not their Government, have, however, one undeniable right, innate in human nature, derived from the practices of Christian civilisation, based upon mercy to the weak and protection to the helpless. That right is to hold Germany responsible in the eyes of mankind for the existence of the present civil population of Belgium. The laws of war have been stretched to the uttermost in that hapless kingdom ; but the laws of war make the conqueror responsible for the lives and welfare of conquered peoples.

GEORGE HARVEY.

George Harvey, President of the well-known publishing firm of Harper and Brothers, published an "Open Letter" to "The Times" in the March Number (1915) of the "North American Review," of which he is the Editor. The following paragraphs are from this letter :—

It is not because of ties of kinship as between nations; not at all. We do not consider that the United States as a political entity is in debt to England. . . . Neither to France, though ever friendly, nor to Russia, though everlastingly grateful, does the United States acknowledge obligations of such a nature as to impel embroilment in causes not her own. Moreover, as a people, we have quite as much in common with the thrifty, industrious, home-loving Germans as with English, French, or Russians. . . .

Why, then, are we for you and your Allies? For no other reason in the world except that you are continuing the great battle for government of, for, and by the people which we began when at Lexington we fired the shot that was heard around the world—for the glorious cause that Franklin, and Jefferson, and Madison wrote for, that Patrick Henry spoke for, that Washington and Jackson fought for, that Lincoln died for, that McKinley suffered for, that every American statesman worthy of the title now lives for. . . .

To our minds, then, the real issue is not, as your people seem to think, mere militarism; it is the hideous conception of which militarism is but one of many manifestations; it is despotism itself; the despotism which united our people originally in armed

86 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

resistance and which is no less hateful to us now than it was then.

Neutral? Yes, in the name of the nation, but not in our heart of hearts. We are for the England which has been gradually freeing the world while Germany has been planning to enslave it. No one of the great colonies which owe her so much and are responding so nobly to her call is more true to the glorious aspiration for which she is now giving her life-blood than these United States.

JOHN GRIER HIBBEN.

John Grier Hibben, LL.D., President of Princeton University, is the author of various works on logic and philosophy. The paragraphs below are from a letter to the "New York Times," written on Nov. 24th, 1914 :—

Some time ago I received with many others an appeal "To the Civilised World!" from certain distinguished representatives of German science and art. I at once wrote to Prof. Eucken, whom I know, and who is one of the signers of this document. I wished to draw his attention particularly to the second statement of this appeal, which is as follows :

"It is not true that we trespassed in neutral Belgium. It has been proved that France and England had resolved on such a trespass, and it has likewise been proved that Belgium had agreed to their doing so."

and I stated to him that "It is naturally to be expected of a group of scholars that where reference is made to proof, some citation should be given both of the sources of the proof and of its nature. I am sure you will agree with me that it is of the very essence of scholarly method in the treatment of any subject whatsoever that one should cite his authority as regards every important and significant statement that is made. No one of the distinguished group of scholars signing their names to this letter would think of writing an article in his own specialty and not add in the text or in a footnote the complete list of authorities for his several assertions.

88 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

“ In your appeal, however, the most important statement by far which you make, and the one bearing most intimately upon the honour and integrity of your nation, is left without even the attempt to support it, save the bare assertion by you and your colleagues. In the interests of a fair understanding of Germany's position, I feel that it is incumbent upon you to give us who are under such a deep debt of gratitude to German scholarship in our own lives the opportunity of a full knowledge of all the facts which definitely bear upon this present situation.”

HENRY MARION HOWE.

Henry Marion Howe, LL.D., son of Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe and Julia Ward Howe, was Professor of Metallurgy at Columbia University from 1897 till his quite recent resignation. The following paragraphs are from an article in the "New York Tribune" of November 12th, 1914 :—

If we are to have a world alliance for restraining military aggression, should not that alliance be formed now rather than after the subjugation of the Allies shall have left no unsubjugated civilised powers collectively strong enough to restrain Germany? The world's present power to crush the aggressor suffices. If we allow this war to go against the Allies, shall we not thereby lose perhaps the last golden opportunity?

If our danger seems remote, is not that because we have not given it thought?

If the great work of the Allies is to prevent Germany becoming irresistible, is not this as necessary to our preservation as to theirs? If so, do not honour and dignity call on us to assume our share in the burden of this prevention?

WILLIAM DEAN HOWELLS.

The following letter was addressed by W. D. Howells, the novelist, to the "New York Sun," on February 1st, 1915 :—

Will you allow me to express a mild surprise, and some pain, at the part you have taken against our possible *entente* with Germany in a certain event ?

You seem to think that if we get into trouble with France and England, not to mention Russia and Japan, by our resistance of the Allies' right to search our German-American ships, we shall certainly be beaten unless we range ourselves definitely on the side of the Kaiser. You seem to see neither honour nor profit for our democratic commonwealth in the friendship of a cultivated despotism. You do not or will not look forward to the triumph when we shall be conformed to the German ideal in our civic life ; yet it ought to be clear to you that this blessing is what we may confidently hope for. The system which combines the functions of the schoolmaster and the drill sergeant is surely something to be desired by every patriotic American ; and have you no longing for *lèse majesté*, for universal conscription and an iron-sided military staff ? Can you see no advantage for American youth in the teaching of such German professors as have taken it for granted that we could not know our minds, or had none to know, on questions of international morality or of mere humanity ? Cannot you forecast a distinct gain for our posterity by our renouncing, now and forever, under the tutelage of these gentlemen, the notions of our political nonage ?

AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR 91

Shall we not unquestionably enrich ourselves by exchanging our Anglo-American literature for the German, and having that language taught in our schools, as it is in those of Alsatia and Poland, instead of the native speech? Do not you know the superiority of the romantic sculpture of the Sieges-Allee over the reality of the French art which we have hitherto studied? Would not you yourselves much rather print *The Sun* in Gothic type than the barbaric Roman characters which you now use?

In a word, can you imagine nothing noble in a voluntary Belgium?

The questions crowd upon me, but I will ask only one more: Suppose the Allies should triumph in the battle which they believe they are fighting for free men and free minds, for justice and honour among the nations, for peace and good will on earth, will not it be a good thing for us to remember that we once did our worst to embarrass them, since nothing could discourage them?

HENRY JAMES.

From a private letter by Mr. Henry James, the novelist, communicated with the writer's consent :—

This grand old country has found herself again, found her soul and her special store of energy, on sides that had fallen far too much into eclipse ; thereby really renewing her genius and her sincerity. The nation is taking it all and doing it, facing it and meaning it, worthily and splendidly. . . . At this hour she is in a perfectly magnificent moral position, the proudest, to my mind, of her history ; and the considerable, the *very* considerable, deficiencies in her material preparations are only the more shining evidence of that.

ROBERT UNDERWOOD JOHNSON.

Robert Underwood Johnson, L.H.D., the poet, was Editor and Associate-Editor of the "Century Magazine" from 1881 to 1913. The following extract is from a letter to Mr. Edmund Gosse, dated December 29th, 1914 :—

You at least do not need to be told that America is heart and soul in sympathy with your country in this war. Our neutrality is a *burning* neutrality. Everybody speaks out, and save a few professors and the German-Americans (and not all of them by a long shot) on the right side.

I saw fifteen hundred picked lawyers of the country at the annual meeting of the American Bar Association the other day in Washington applaud heartily the statement of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick that Canada would give her last man and her last dollar in defence of the great system of civil liberty represented by England, and joining cordially in the applause was the Chief Justice of the United States.

The German propaganda, although aided by Bernard Shaw, is making no headway. People read, laugh, and are of the same opinion still.

Our time will come to be of use—and it will be more effective than by battleships. Everybody I know is occupied with relief measures, and the women and girls are all knitting. All sorts of sales and benefits for the Allies are on. There are moreover five or six funds, chiefly for Belgians and French. Nothing is talked about except the war. "Is there any good news to-night?" we all ask each other. We think of your noble fellows who have gone to their death almost as if they were our own.

ROBERT M. JOHNSTON.

Robert M. Johnston, Professor of History at Harvard University, has published several works on Modern History, especially in the field of military tactics and strategy. The following extract is from a private letter of February 11th, 1915 :—

Opinion in this country has been modified by the course of events. The German propaganda, open and occult, has made some headway, though not a great deal, and is an embarrassment. The ancient difficulty as to neutral commerce creates friction, as is inevitable. I also think that the opinion begins to gain ground that the commercial and military relation of England to the European continent is a difficult one, and that she will require immense efforts to solve the present problem, to say nothing of any situation that may follow the war. But, making exception of the German Americans, there can be no question, I believe, of the widespread sympathy of this country for England. It tends to become more discriminating or critical, but on the other hand, it reposes on very solid foundations—a similar outlook on questions of humanity, law, and civilisation, and a common language and understanding. For myself, what I most hope for is to see both your country and mine realising through this struggle that the scale of nations is changing ; that Europe is already overcharged, and that the future belongs to nations not the size of England, but one hundred times larger. I hope England will see that in the future the English-speaking people must group themselves in terms of bulk, with the North American continent as a centre ; and I hope that the

American people will begin to realise that they have international responsibilities up to which they must live, if the work of western civilisation is to be carried further.

DAVID STARR JORDAN.

David Starr Jordan, LL.D., President and Chancellor of Leland Stanford University, wrote the following lines in reference to the Peace Palace at The Hague :—

In a recent number of a popular magazine a well-known writer uses these words : “ Towering above the Carnegie Plein glitters the Peace Palace, history’s grimmest jest and the world’s greatest monument to failure.”

Shall we ever need these halls again? Is the riot of murder and robbery for which no man nor nation dare stand sponsor the last word in history? Is all human achievement to go the way of Malines and Louvain and Rheims? Is there no power higher than the armed State? Is there no public opinion, no voice of God, above the voice of the howitzer? Is the crush of rival military efficiencies the end of our Christian civilisation?

We do not believe this. We have faith in man and, therefore, in the God within him. . . .

* * * * *

What, then, is the grimmest jest, the costliest failure in all history? Its name is Military Efficiency. It is the search for peace through hate. It is the armed peace, the use of barbarism as a defence against barbarism. . . .

* * * * *

Since the writer began this note, barely an hour ago, the war has already in that short time cost more

than the Peace Palace at The Hague. Every day of war costs forty times Mr. Carnegie's gift. Every six hours of daylight Europe spends in destruction as much as all the world has ever paid to bring on the peace of security and mutual trust.

SINCLAIR KENNEDY.

Sinclair Kennedy, member of the Boston Bar, has made a special study of the federation of the English-speaking nations, and recently published a very scholarly work on this subject, entitled "The Pan-Angles" (Longmans, Green & Co., 1914). The following extracts are from private letters :—

. . . I am as much with you as any man can be who happens to be classified under another nationality. As I believe the six Britannic nations are now fighting America's battles for her, there is only one way I can feel. I am one of the few who believe that America should enter this war immediately, on the side of the Allies, to uphold the English-speaking civilisation. . . .

Resuming the subject of American opinion concerning the war. The other day Dr. Eliot gave a talk at the Harvard Club of Boston. . . . That talk was given on the assumption that his audience was anti-German, and he made no bones of failing to apologise in any way for his attitude. . . .

I have been searching for pro-German publications. One of them I found on a news-stand in Brookline. I bought it because of the poem on its cover. . . . I then determined to send you a copy of the paper, and succeeded in obtaining another copy at the same news-stand, which is the only place where I have seen it exposed. The dealer told me that the two copies sold to me were the only ones he had sold, and that he received these copies gratis from the publishers. You will see that the publication was begun only last spring. . . . I imagine that some of the other

American pro-German opinion is similarly manufactured. . . .

My own task seems to be talking to people about the war with a view to explaining not how the war began, concerning which I am not interested, but how it should end and why the United States should at once enter the war on the side of the Allies.

GEORGE TRUMBULL LADD.

George Trumbull Ladd, D.D., LL.D., was Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy at Yale from 1881 to 1905, and is the author of many well-known books on psychology and philosophy. He is a lineal descendant of Elder William Brewster and Governor William Bradford. The following article appeared in "The Times" of November 21st, 1914 :—

There can be no doubt, I think, that the great body of the American people heartily approve of the difficult efforts of President Wilson and the Government at Washington to maintain a strict neutrality in both word and deed in the war now raging in Europe. As a nation we do not want to be involved in this strife, or in war with any other nation. We are not a military people ; and although we can fight if we have to, in general the great enlargement of our army and navy has hitherto seemed opposed to the interests and moral convictions of the great majority of the people.

The feeling is by no means the same when it comes to the interpretation of, or compliance with, President Wilson's exhortation to the people at large to remain "neutral." If this exhortation means not to hold or to express frankly and fearlessly our moral judgments and our sympathies with the cause we esteem to be in the right, the response of the public is not in the way of acquiescence, and it is not going to be. Here I am sure I speak not for myself alone, but for many thousands of others.

To speak somewhat confidently of the class to which I belong ; they are, with few exceptions, intelligently anti-German, warmly and openly on the side

of the Allies. For twenty-five and more years we have watched the growth of a haughty and aggressive military imperialism. We have been startled as we have heard our German friends fairly hiss out the words: "I hate the English; every German hates the English." We have wondered at the ignorant scorn with which the advances of peaceful civilisation in France, Russia, and Japan have been treated by those who, by their very devotion to this cause of a military imperialism, have been losing their own place in the fore-rank of the civilising humanities. Some of us, like myself, have seen something of the inside of the attempts on the part of the German Government—notably in the summer of 1911—to seize the occasions when Great Britain's hands seemed tied for anticipating the growing preparations of France and Russia; and thus to crush these two nations in time to get by them at its most hated of all rivals in commerce and colonisation. How can we fail to have and to express, in all proper ways, our detestation of such a policy and our sympathy with the legitimate efforts to give it a final rebuke?

The great majority of the intelligent citizens of the United States, excluding the "hyphenated Americans"—mostly German and sparsely Irish—sympathise warmly with the Allies. Nor are the causes of this sympathy so very hidden or far to seek. I shall mention the four most prominent.

For several years past, Americans have been reading—for the most part with feelings of puzzled amusement—the various manifestoes of his Imperial Majesty, the German Emperor, touching "My army," "my navy," the manifest destiny of Germany, and the part it has been divinely intended to play in a vast scheme of *Weltpolitik*. But it was only the outbreak of the war, which was to them so sudden and unexpected, that set into the clear light of facts the serious and even sinister meaning of all this, involving

a theory and a form of government which is distrusted by and abhorrent to the great body of the American public. The philosophy of Nietzsche, the doctrine that might makes right, is as yet foreign to them.

It was, however, the treatment given to Belgium which started, and which has maintained a steadily-rising tide of resentment towards Germany. The people of the United States have been cherishing the hope that treaties of arbitration and the increased observance of the amenities of international relations, even in times of war, might serve to mitigate the economic burdens of militarism and the propagation of feelings of hatred between races and nations. They were shocked at the perjury which violated the contract to maintain the neutrality of a relatively weak and wholly peaceful nation. Making all allowances for exaggerations, while knowing that none of the Allied nations, and not themselves in the conduct of war in the Philippines, have been free from individual atrocities, they find in this no excuse, and no palliation even, for the way of Germany with Belgium.

But above all, perhaps, is the feeling which is rapidly growing out of the popular apprehension of the fundamental character of this monstrous struggle. The American people are coming to see that it is a life-and-death grapple between two great and antagonistic political principles. On the one side are the two nations who are the chief exponents of government in the form of a military imperialism under the leadership of haughty Royal Houses claiming to rule their subjects by inherited divine right. On the other side are the nations which represent the cause of a government of constitutional nationalism. Between these two theories of government they have no difficulty in choosing.

One more reason is rising into prominence. The American people are beginning to ask themselves: "What is likely to happen to us, if the Germans have

their way in this struggle?" The Government at present, and the great body of the people at all times, have no desire to extend the possessions of the United States by conquest. But, on the other hand, they do not desire that the Governments of Europe should by violence extend their possessions on this continent. What, however, will ultimately happen in South America, Central America, and Mexico if Germany wins in this war and then takes another quarter of a century for recuperation without a change in its present policy of extending Germanic control and Germanic culture by superiority of numbers and modern "scientific" armament? This is the question which many are seriously asking at the present time.

There is, in my judgment, no fear that the extraordinary efforts which Germany is making to influence the attitude of the American people will have any considerable effect. Indeed, thus far they are having just the opposite effect from that intended. This is true, not only of the more definite efforts of the Government, but also of the more personal and private assurances of a united and aggrieved Germany, as represented by the pens of her scholars and men of science. Two months ago I felt myself sure that there was another and better Germany, that would not possibly be afflicted with the obsession which had seized and conquered the Emperor and the military classes. But when professors of theology, ethics, and philosophy, with whom we have been on terms of personal or professional respect, can justify such things in the name of morality and patriotism, we can only respond with a kind of ethical amazement.

ARTHUR ONCKEN LOVEJOY.

Arthur Oncken Lovejoy, Professor of Philosophy at Johns Hopkins University, published in "The Nation" (New York) of September 24th, 1914, a reply to the pro-German pamphlet entitled "Truth about Germany." The following sentences are from this reply:—

SIR,—Americans leaving Germany during the second fortnight of August received as a farewell gift a substantial pamphlet entitled, "Truth about Germany: Facts about the War." This publication seems worth bringing to the notice of other Americans, especially of American scholars, not because of its actual contents, but because of the relation between its contents and the profession and character of several of the persons with whose endorsement it was issued. The pamphlet was prepared by a board of editors which included Dr. Drechsler, director of the *Amerika-Institut*; Count Reventlow, Professor Dr. Francke, several professional authors, members of the Reichstag, and others; and it was issued with the sanction of an "honorary committee" comprising, besides many figures of the highest distinction in German public life and in finance, such eminent scholars as Harnack, Kühnemann, Lamprecht, Von Schmoller, Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, and Wilhelm Wundt. The document was manifestly designed, not for historians or publicists, but for the enlightenment of the many educated Americans who had hitherto known little of European politics and diplomacy; and the impressive list of great *savants* attached to the pamphlet was evidently intended to give weight to the opinions expressed, and to inspire confidence in its statements of fact.

Every American recipient of the pamphlet who subsequently took the trouble to examine the entire published evidence in the case must have speedily discovered the statements of specific historical fact in the passages cited to be either direct falsehoods or *suggestiones falsi*. . . . But it should be added that the publication in question is marked by a yet more singular *suppressio veri*; it contains no hint of what are perhaps the two most decisive of the "facts about the war."

*

*

*

*

*

The professional class, in the country where it has played its greatest part, has signally failed, at the most critical moment in German history, to perform its proper function—the function of detached criticism, of cool consideration, of insisting that facts, and all the relevant facts, be known and faced. It appears to be shouting with the rest for a wholly avoidable war of which, in nearly all non-German eyes, the moral indefensibility seems exceeded only by its fatal un-wisdom from a purely national point of view.

WILLIAM MACDONALD.

William Macdonald, LL.D., is Professor of History in Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island. Among his numerous books may be mentioned "From Jefferson to Lincoln," contributed to the Home University Series (1913). The following extract is from a private letter of March 4th, 1915:—

Three months ago, it seemed not unlikely that the feeling of pronounced friendship for the Allies, and particularly for Great Britain, which had been a striking characteristic of American public opinion since the outbreak of the war, might before long be replaced by a feeling which, if not less friendly to England, was at least more friendly to Germany. There are several reasons why this change has not, to any marked extent, come about. One is the belief that a powerful pro-German lobby, well-organized and abundantly supplied with money, has been actively at work in Washington to secure either Congressional or Executive action which, while perhaps nominally aimed at England, would in reality benefit Germany. Another is the extraordinarily unwise course of Dr. Bernhard Dernburg, the recognised spokesman of the German cause in this country, whose unfair and incorrect assertions have been so often exposed that there is no longer any confidence to be felt in him. Another is the gradual comprehension of the extent to which Belgium has been devastated, and its people made dependent upon the bounty of the United States and other nations. Still another reason is the conviction that German militarism, as something distinct from German military organization and efficiency, is so far opposed to national

human happiness and social progress as to make it a menace to world peace.

So far as I am able to discern, American public opinion is still overwhelmingly on the side of the Allies. Nothing yet published has shaken the conviction that England not only did not desire war, but that she did all that she could do to avert it. Her conduct of the war thus far is adjudged to have been honourable. To the extent to which the cause of England is the cause of a civilization nearest akin to our own, England has the moral support of the American people. We do not wish, however, to be drawn into the struggle actively in any way; and while we are properly sensitive to the interests of American commerce, and must protect them, we feel much confidence that England, in the strenuousness of her warfare, will not encroach upon them, and that we will be permitted to pursue as honourable a course as a neutral as England desires to pursue as a belligerent. Most of all, we hope for a speedy peace, concluded before mutual exhaustion shall have made a continuance of the struggle impossible, and laid upon foundations which will enable it to endure.

JAMES BRANDER MATTHEWS.

James Brander Matthews, D.C.L., D.Litt., LL.D., Professor of Dramatic Literature in Columbia University, New York, and author of numerous works, contributed a letter to the "New York Times" (Sept. 18th, 1914), from which we quote the following passage :—

In the earnest and sincere appeals of various distinguished Germans, Prof. Eucken, Prof. Haeckel, and the several authors of "The Truth About Germany," we find frequent references to "German culture" as though it was of a superior quality to the culture of every other nationality; and we seem to perceive also a sustaining belief that Germany is not only the defender of civilization, but its foremost exponent. We have no right to question the good faith of scholars of the high character of Eucken and Haeckel; and we cannot doubt their being honestly possessed of the conviction that Germany is the supreme example of a highly civilized State and the undisputed leader in the arts and sciences which represent culture. It is plain that these German writers take this for granted and that they would be indignantly surprised if it should be questioned.

To an American who feels himself a sharer of the noble heritage of English literature, and who has sat for more than forty years at the feet of the masters of French literature, this claim cannot but come as a startling surprise.

The most obvious characteristic of a highly civilized man is his willingness to keep his word, at whatever cost to himself. For reasons satisfactory to itself, Germany broke its pledge to respect the neutrality of

Luxemburg and of Belgium. It is another characteristic of civilization to cherish the works of art which have been bequeathed to us by the past. For reasons satisfactory to itself Germany destroyed Louvain, more or less completely. It is a final characteristic of civilized man to be humane and to refrain from ill-treating the blameless. For reasons satisfactory to itself Germany dropped bombs in the unbesieged city of Antwerp and caused the death of innocent women and children. Here are three instances where German culture has been tested and found wanting.

THE STANDARD BEARER OF CULTURE.

But it may be urged that war has its own exigencies and that these three instances of uncivilized conduct partook of the nature of military necessities. Turning from the outrages of war to the triumphs of peace, let us make a disinterested attempt to find out just what foundation there may be for the implicit assertion that Germany is the standard bearer of civilization.

Perhaps it is too petty to point out that manners are the outward and visible sign of civilization, and that in this respect the Germans have not yet attained to the standard set by the French and the English. But it is not insignificant to record that the Germans alone retain a barbaric mediaeval alphabet, while the rest of Western Europe has adopted the more legible and more graceful Roman letter; and it is not unimportant to note that German prose style is cumbersome and uncouth. Taken collectively, these things seem to show German culture is a little lacking in the social instinct, the desire to make things easy and pleasant for others. It is this social instinct which is the dominating influence in French civilization and which has given to French civilization its incomparable

urbanity and amenity. It is to the absence of this social instinct, to the inability to understand the attitude of other parties to a discussion, to the unwillingness to appreciate their point of view, that we may ascribe the failure of German diplomacy, a failure which has left her almost without a friend in her hour of need. And success in diplomacy is one of the supreme tests of civilization.

The claim asserted explicitly or implicitly in behalf of German culture seems to be based on the belief that the Germans are leaders in the arts and in the sciences. So far as the art of war is concerned there is no need to-day to dispute the German claim. It is to the preparation for war that Prussia has devoted its utmost energy for half a century—in fact, ever since Bismarck began to make ready for the seizing of unwilling Schleswig-Holstein. And so far as the art of music is concerned there is also no need to cavil.

But what about the other and more purely intellectual arts? How many are the contemporary painters and sculptors and architects of Germany who have succeeded in winning the cosmopolitan reputation which has been the reward of a score of the artists of France and of half a dozen of the artists of America?

SINCE GOETHE, WHO?

When we consider the art of letters we find a similar condition. Germany has had philosophers and historians of high rank; but in pure literature, in what used to be called "*belles-lettres*," from the death of Goethe in 1832 to the advent of the younger generation of dramatists, Sudermann and Hauptmann and the rest, in the final decade of the nineteenth century—that is to say, for a period of nearly sixty years—only one German author succeeded in winning a worldwide celebrity—and Heine was a Hebrew, who died in Paris,

out of favour with his countrymen, perhaps because he had been unceasing in calling attention to the deficiencies of German culture. There were in Germany many writers who appealed strongly to their fellow-countrymen, but except only the solitary Heine no German writer attained to the international fame achieved by Cooper and by Poe, by Walt Whitman and by Mark Twain. And it was during these three-score years of literary aridity in Germany that there was a superb literary fecundity in Great Britain and in France, and that each of these countries produced at least a score of authors whose names are known throughout the world. Even sparsely settled Scandinavia brought forth a triumvirate, Bjornsen, Ibsen, and Brandes, without compeers in Germany. And from Russia the fame of Turgenev and of Tolstoy spread abroad a knowledge of the heart and mind of a great people who are denounced by Germans as barbarous.

It is probably in the field of science, pure and applied, that the defenders of the supremacy of German culture would take their last stand. That the German contribution to science has been important is indisputable; yet it is equally indisputable that the two dominating scientific leaders of the second half of the nineteenth century are Darwin and Pasteur. It is in chemistry that the Germans have been pioneers; yet the greatest of modern chemists is Mendeleef. It was Hertz who made the discovery which is the foundation of Marconi's invention; but although not a few valuable discoveries are to be credited to the Germans, perhaps almost as many as to either the French or the British, the German contribution in the field of invention, in the practical application of scientific discovery, has been less than that of France, less than that of Great Britain, and less than that of the United States. The Germans contributed little or nothing to the development of the railroad, the

steamboat, the automobile, the aeroplane, the telegraph, the telephone, the phonograph, the photograph, the moving picture, the electric light, the sewing machine, and the reaper and binder. Even those dread instruments of war, the revolver and the machine gun, the turreted ship, the torpedo, and the submarine, are not due to the military ardour of the Germans. It would seem as though the Germans had been lacking in the inventiveness which is so marked a feature of our modern civilization.

In this inquiry there has been no desire to deny the value of the German contributions to the arts and to the sciences. These contributions are known to all ; they speak for themselves ; they redound to the honour of German culture ; and for them, whatever may be their number, the other nations of the world are eternally indebted to Germany. But these German contributions are neither important enough nor numerous enough to justify the assumption that German culture is superior or that Germany is entitled to think herself the supreme leader of the arts and of the sciences. No one nation can claim this lofty position, although few would be so bold as to deny the superior achievement of the French in the fine arts and of the English in pure science.

Nations are never accepted by other nations at their own valuation ; and the Germans need not be surprised that we are now astonished to find them asserting their natural self-appreciation, with the apparent expectation that it will pass unchallenged. The world owes a debt to modern Germany beyond all question, but this is far less than the debt owed to England and to France. It would be interesting if some German, speaking with authority, should now be moved to explain to us Americans the reasons which underlie the insistent assertion of the superiority of German civilization. Within the past few weeks we have been forced to gaze at certain of the less pleasant

aspects of the German character ; and we have been made to see that the militarism of the Germans is in absolute contradiction to the preaching and to the practice of the great Goethe, to whom they proudly point as the ultimate representative of German culture.

CHARLES LEONARD MOORE.

Charles Leonard Moore, poet and author, contributed a paper on "German Culture" to "The Dial" for December 1st, 1914, which ends as follows :—

To sum up, if all the various forms of culture can be ranked as equal, then the Teutons may be credited with a greater assortment of gifts for mankind than any other people except the Greeks or the Italians, ancient and modern. But there have been a good many of them, and their *per capita* of the products of culture is probably far less than the French or English. And the different forms of culture cannot be considered equal. Opinions will differ, of course, as to the value of the different arts and activities of mankind. But there is a pretty general consensus that literature, and especially poetry, is the fine, consummate flower of mortal effort. In poetry, the Germans are babes in swaddling clothes beside the full-grown English. In war and manners they must yield to the French. In music alone are they so superior as to be able to say "Here is our throne, let all men bow to it." It does not seem to us, therefore, that their culture is so overwhelmingly superior to any single European State that they should seek to impose it by force of arms upon the whole world. As if culture could be imposed by force !

SARA NORTON.

The following extracts are from letters (October 15th and December 5th, 1914) by Miss Sara Norton, daughter of the late Prof. Charles Eliot Norton, the well-known authority on Art, and author, among numerous other books, of "The Life and Letters of John Ruskin" :—

I am impelled to write and tell you that I think there are many people—Americans—who fully sympathise with your point of view, and wish America could take—would take—a different stand about Belgium—whose wrongs surely cry out to Heaven. We may be saving our own skins in this dreadful hour, but for a great country and a rich one to look on while Belgium, prostrate, bleeding, ruined, holds up the torn paper for the world to see, and we do nothing but stand back, I must confess seems to me to put us in an ignoble position. The struggle has reached a point when, if America said : " I will fight, too, for the principles that are at stake, and that England and France are maintaining," no true American could regret the grave undertaking for the sake of those ideals which are in jeopardy.

If hopes and sympathies avail anything, American feeling is overwhelmingly with the Allies, but a most ingenious, far-reaching, and amazing German propaganda is being carried on in this country, which England should not under-estimate, nor quite neglect to take into account. The public, the private individual, are being bombarded by statements from Germany—papers, pamphlets, and letters—(evidently written by order). I have had such from a cousin in Hanover, setting forth Germany's version of the facts, and her

glorious victories, and her *peaceful* impulses ! That this propaganda has its origin in much "underground" work is clear, but we also have the official agents, Münsterberg, Dernburg, and the rest in our midst. It is now announced that Herr Kühnemann is "to tour" the country lecturing on "The Truth about Germany." I send you a paper which has an excellent editorial on this subject. It seems to me that Englishmen at home cannot serve their country better than by judicious writing to some of our Western and country papers putting England's case, and what she is fighting for before that portion of the public which reads the newspapers and nothing else, and which has no affiliations with Europe. I am convinced there are many good, honest Americans, living quiet lives and never leaving home, who, knowing all the names Germany is calling England, wonder if there is something in it.

* * * * *

Nothing strikes me so much to-day as the difficulty of arriving at the truth ; there are so many statements and counter-statements from able people ; but in all the German propaganda, and in the great "output" of war documents which they are flooding the world with, in those I have seen there seems to me a great lack of candour and of meeting the actual arguments put forth on the other side. A great deal of the German writing is "about it and about," and leads nowhere. The German papers I have seen seem all prepared and doctored to meet a given sentiment, that is, the expected loyalty and acquiescence of the people. As for the propaganda here it has failed where they most desired it, doubtless, to produce an effect. The German-American, I suppose, the Fatherland counts on to be loyal, but the American whom they have tried to convince, remains coldly unmoved by every appeal in their pamphlets, their books, and their newspaper letters. The reason for this, I take it, is not that the

average American has read a great mass of German statements, but that he has read the daily news in regard to the war, and he is shocked, horrified, and appalled by the things that Germany has allowed to be done, away from the battlefield. The burning of Louvain, the shelling of Rheims, the utter ruin of Belgium—have done more to draw the sympathies of the plain man and woman in this country to the side of the Allies than actual knowledge of the facts about the cause of the war.

FRANK ILSLEY PARADISE.

The Rev. Frank Ilsley Paradise, B.A., B.D. (Yale), Rector of Grace Church, West Medford, Massachusetts, is the author of "The Church and the Individual," "Christianity and Commerce," and "A Nation at School." In an address to his parish, dated Sunday, January 17th, 1915, occur the following paragraphs :—

With the war between nations I am not now concerned. It is the immense, the incalculable, struggle between two types of civilisation that is shaking the world to its foundations. How sadly ineffective Christian civilisation has hitherto been ; how slothfully and how limply it has followed its high ideals is revealed in the lurid light of the battle-fields of Europe. Our self-complacency has been smashed by the blow of an iron fist, and we are stunned and bewildered in an agony of pain. Out of that pain, to millions and millions of souls, is to come a new birth—a reawakening to the spiritual values of our civilisation. For, by the words of Germany's great teachers, Christian civilisation is the real stake in this mighty conflict. The fear of her far-flung challenge of a definitely anti-Christian philosophy of the State, and the stupendous power with which that philosophy is enforced, has not yet, I think, shaken the heart of America. There are political reasons enough for us to dread a sweeping victory of German arms, but a far greater danger which threatens our democratic institutions is the possibility of the enforcement of the German principle of civilisation. I wonder if you know just what that principle is. It is, in general, that the law of nations is the law of the survival of the fittest. Germany is the

fittest, and in her upward progress it is not only her right but her duty to hew and hack her way through every opposing obstacle in her path of destiny. "For us there are two alternatives and no third—world dominion or ruin," says Bernhardt. I quote at random from my note book: "Christian morality is personal and social, and in its nature cannot be political." "The acts of the State cannot be judged by the standard of individual morality." "Each nation evolves its own conceptions of right." "In the business of war men must not regard the massacres, the burnings, the battles, etc." "The natural law, to which all laws of nature can be reduced, is the law of struggle; for the State it is a persistent struggle for possession, power, and sovereignty." "Germany shall not confront the twentieth century and its thronging vicissitudes as the worshipper of an alien (*i.e.* Christian) God, thrall of an alien morality." These bits of sentences can hardly suggest the power, the determination, the utter singleness of aim in the teachings of the writers. The words tingle with enthusiasm, with intense conviction and with passionate hatred. The State rises before the modern German mind like a glorious divinity, which claims the whole love, the absolute devotion, and the willing sacrifice of all its worshippers. "The individual must forget his egoism. He should recognise how his own life is nothing worth in comparison with the welfare of the community," says Treitschke.

In her mad lust for dominion Germany has sent forth a ringing challenge to the heroic soul of Christendom. I rejoice that America is expressing her sympathy and helpfulness in such nobly generous ways to the nations who are fighting her battles. But the gentle grace of Charity has little place in the religion of Power. Only the daring and heroic mind can meet in equal combat the mighty national Goliath who is hammering at the citadel of Christian civilisation. As yet our suffering has been sympathetic. We have been

far-off spectators of the struggle of empires. But the issue is being forced upon us by the remorseless logic of events. We are being driven to a decision. The world of easy-going tolerance is passing away. The nation of individual self-seekers cannot thrive in the high atmosphere of the coming age. It is well for us to remember that from the German point of view we, of all nations of the earth, are the least worthy to exist ; for by the law of the survival of the fittest, a nation without unity or cohesion, without faith or enthusiasm, without national consciousness and devotion, is justly doomed. At length, I do believe, we shall catch the spirit of battle, and fling back the challenge of German nationalism. For we too have a conscious national destiny. The God of Israel has anointed us to champion the cause of the poor, the weak and the down-trodden. We too shall struggle for world power. It will be the helping and healing power of Christian civilisation. We too shall violate the neutrality of nations, but it will be to show pity, and in our love of mercy. Our right of conquest shall be our right to support and comfort the needy and the sorrowful. Our will shall be, not " the will to power," but the will to bless. And the insignia upon our banner will be, not the eagle soaring into the sun, but the cross of sacrifice upon a lonely hill-top. Our hero is not Napoleon, but Christ. We battle not for Corsica, but for Calvary.

CHARLES HENRY PARKHURST.

The Rev. Charles Henry Parkhurst, D.D., LL.D., Pastor of the Madison Square Presbyterian Church, New York, and author of several works, contributed a letter to "The New York Times," of Aug. 23rd, 1914, from which the following extract is taken :—

When a mad dog runs amuck, the policeman shoots him on the spot—not by way of revenge, but as a humanitarian contribution to the security of the public. Now, has a more rabid creature than the Emperor William ever run amuck through the peaceful and prosperous domain of Europe? The policeman makes no argument with the dog and enters into no compromise with him, but deals with him in exclusive regard to the requirements of society and simply blots him out as a public menace. It may not be necessary to strangle Germany, but her claws should be clipped and her teeth filed and enough of her fortifications dismantled to render her harmless, and as heavy a war indemnity imposed as will not drive her to absolute penury.

E. ALEXANDER POWELL.

E. Alexander Powell, author and journalist, acted as a War Correspondent with the Belgian Army in the campaign of the autumn of 1914. He was invited to dine with General von Boehn, Commander of the Ninth German Army. He thus had an opportunity of visiting the German lines and of having a conversation with a highly-placed German official. He published his experiences in a book called "Fighting in Flanders," from which the following quotations are made by permission of Mr. Wm. Heinemann :—

An American, I went to Belgium at the beginning of the war with an open mind. I had few, if any, prejudices. I knew the English, the French, the Belgians, the Germans equally well. I had friends in all four countries and many happy recollections of days I had spent in each. When I left Antwerp, after the German occupation, I was as pro-Belgian as though I had been born under the red-black-and-yellow banner. I had seen a country, one of the loveliest and most peaceable in Europe, invaded by a ruthless and brutal soldiery ; I had seen its towns and cities blackened by fire and broken by shell ; I had seen its churches and its historic monuments destroyed ; I had seen its highways crowded with hunted, homeless fugitives ; I had seen its fertile fields strewn with the corpses of what had once been the manhood of the nation ; I had seen its women left husbandless and its children left fatherless ; I had seen what was once a Garden of the Lord turned into a land of desolation ; and I had seen its people . . . aroused, resourceful, unafraid, and fighting, fighting, fighting. Do you wonder that they captured my imagination, that they won my

admiration? *I am pro-Belgian*; I admit it frankly. I should be ashamed to be anything else.

*

*

*

*

*

The General began by asserting that the accounts of atrocities perpetrated by German troops on Belgian non-combatants were lies. . . .

"Three days ago, General," said I, "I was in Aerschot. The whole town is now but a ghastly, blackened ruin."

"When we entered Aerschot," was the reply, "the son of the Burgomaster came into the room where our officers were dining and assassinated the Chief of Staff. What followed was retribution. The townspeople got only what they deserved."

"But why wreak your vengeance on women and children?" I asked.

"None have been killed," the General asserted positively.

"I'm sorry to contradict you, General," I asserted with equal positiveness, "but I have myself seen their bodies. So has Mr. Gibson, the Secretary of the American Legation in Brussels, who was present during the destruction of Louvain."

"Of course," replied General von Boehn, "there is always danger of women and children being killed during street fighting if they insist on coming into the streets. It is unfortunate, but it is war."

"But how about a woman's body I saw with the hands and feet cut off? How about the white-haired man and his son whom I helped to bury outside of Sempst, who had been killed merely because a retreating Belgian soldier had shot a German soldier outside their house? There were twenty-two bayonet wounds in the old man's face. I counted them. How about the little girl, two years old, who was shot while in her mother's arms by an Uhlan and whose funeral I attended at Heyst-op-den-Berg? How about the old man near

Vilvorde, who was hung by his hands from the rafters of his house and roasted to death by a bonfire being built under him ? ”

The General seemed taken aback by the exactness of my information.

“ Such things are horrible if true,” he said. “ Of course, our soldiers, like soldiers in all armies, sometimes get out of hand and do things which we would never tolerate if we knew it. At Louvain, for example, I sentenced two soldiers to twelve years’ penal servitude each for assaulting a woman.”

“ Apropos of Louvain,” I remarked, “ why did you destroy the library ? ”

“ We regretted that as much as anyone else,” was the answer. “ It caught fire from burning houses and we could not save it.”

“ But why did you burn Louvain at all ? ” I asked.

“ Because the townspeople fired on our troops. We actually found machine-guns in some of the houses. And,” smashing his fist down upon the table, “ whenever civilians fire upon our troops we will teach them a lasting lesson. If women and children insist on getting in the way of bullets so much the worse for the women and children.”

“ How do you explain the bombardment of Antwerp by Zeppelins ? ” I inquired.

“ Zeppelins have orders to drop their bombs only on fortifications and soldiers,” he answered.

“ As a matter of fact,” I remarked, “ they destroyed only private houses and innocent civilians, several of whom were women. If one of those bombs had dropped two hundred yards nearer my hotel I wouldn’t be here to-day smoking one of your excellent cigars.”

“ That is a calamity which, thank God, didn’t happen,” he replied.

“ If you feel for my safety as deeply as that, General,” I said earnestly, “ you can make quite sure

of my coming to no harm by sending no more Zeppelins."

"Well, Herr Powell," he said, laughing, "we will think about it. And," he continued gravely, "I trust that you will tell the American people, through your great paper, what I have told you to-day. Let them hear our side of this atrocity business. It is only justice that they should be made familiar with both sides of the question."

I have quoted my conversation with General von Boehn as nearly verbatim as I can remember it. I have no comments to make. I will leave it to my readers to decide for themselves just how convincing were the answers of the German General Staff—for General von Boehn was but its mouthpiece—to the Belgian accusations.

MORTON PRINCE.

The name of Dr. Morton Prince, an eminent Boston physician, has become familiar to all students of psychology through his remarkable book, "The Dissociation of a Personality." The following paragraphs are from a letter contributed to the "Boston Sunday Post," Feb. 7th, 1915 :—

From the American viewpoint we are forced, however unwillingly, to the conclusion (in consideration of German warfare and German ideals of government) that Germany must be regarded in war as the enemy of civilisation, and in peace as the enemy of democracy.

Between the autocratic German viewpoint and the democratic American viewpoint there is an irreconcilable conflict—a conflict of ideals—that cannot be settled by argument, by citation of facts, by appeals to logic or to moral judgment.

It can only be settled by the arbitrament of arms. If the Allies win, we may expect that the ideals of the democratic viewpoint will receive a world-wide acceptance. It was thus that the conflict between the ideals of freedom and slavery was settled in this country only by the acceptance of the arbitrament of war.

If, on the other hand, Germany wins, the United States of America still remains to be settled with, and that conflict of viewpoints, between American democratic ideals and German autocratic ideals, will still exist, to be settled some day in the future by the arbitrament of the sword.

GEORGE HAVEN PUTNAM.

George Haven Putnam, Litt.D., a leading New York publisher, is well known in two continents as a champion of international copyright. As a young man he went through the American Civil War, retiring with the rank of Major, and he has recently published a most interesting account of his experiences, under the title of "Memories of My Youth." The following extracts are from letters contributed by him to "The Times" and "The Bookseller" (the latter addressed to Mr. Karl W. Hiersemann, a publisher of Leipzig) :—

My criticisms, and those of Americans generally who are in a position to judge impartially in regard to the issues of the war, have been restricted to the *official acts* which have attended the devastation of Belgium and the destruction of cathedrals and towns in France. We condemn these acts not because they have been committed by Germany, but because they are in themselves abominable, and are contrary to precedent and to civilised standards. As an old soldier and as a student of the history of campaigns I have some knowledge of war regulations and of the procedure of civilised countries. I maintain the contention that unless or until a city is under siege (and the notice of siege is, of course, a caution to citizens to withdraw as far as such withdrawal is possible) the throwing of bombs into groups of unarmed people, men, women, and children, is not warfare in any present use of the term. The killing of these unoffending people can, of course, have no effect whatsoever upon the success or the direction of the campaign ; and if this be the case, such killing is properly to be characterised as murder.

I am myself familiar with Germany. I am an old-time German student, and I have German friends on both sides of the Atlantic ; I am therefore in a position to understand and to sympathise with the legitimate aspirations and ideals of these German friends. I am convinced, however, that no nation can secure in this twentieth century its rightful development unless its national conduct is regulated with "decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

* * * * *

The American people were at the time the war began, and are still, in a better position than any other people to arrive at an impartial judgment in regard to the matters at issue. We have in our population a larger German element than is possessed by any other nation outside of Germany ; we have had in our hands, both through direct correspondence with Germany and through the comprehensive and very persistent efforts of the German publication committee in the United States, an enormous mass of material presenting the German side of the case ; the defence for German actions that have been criticised ; the intentions and the ideals of the German Empire, and of the people back of the Empire. No attempt has been made by any one of the other parties to the contest to influence public opinion as has been done by Germany, and it is necessary to report that, as far as is concerned the opinion of Americans who are not German by birth or by heritage, the attempt to secure American approval for German action has utterly failed. It has, in fact, failed with not a few of the more important of the German-Americans themselves—the two or three survivors of the men of '48 and the children of the forty-eighters. In addition to this special mass of German material, the Americans have had in their hands, and have examined intelligently and impartially, the official documents or books, Yellow Books, Grey Books,

etc., of England, France, and Belgium ; and also the official book of Germany.

*

*

*

*

*

After a careful examination of the evidence, the Americans have convinced themselves, *first*, that the responsibility for initiating this desolating and abominable war rests with Germany and with Austria, and primarily with Germany, which controlled the action of Austria.

Second. That the war had long been prepared for by Germany. The aggressive policy that the Empire had in view is clearly set forth by Bernhardt, and the steps that have been taken and the new methods of action brought into the warfare are directly in line with the counsel and the teachings of Bernhardt.

Third. That the larger or ultimate purpose of the struggle is the breaking up of the British Empire, of large portions of which Germany hopes to become the inheritor.

In sojourns in England during the past fifty years I never read or heard an English utterance expressing desire for anything that belonged to Germany. In Germany, and among German-Americans outside of Germany, I have repeatedly heard the prophecy that the English Empire must be broken up, and that its Colonial power must be transferred to Germany. It is my belief that there has been during the years since 1871 a persistent concoction of mis-statements and malicious statements about England which have had for their purpose the arousing of German antagonism. I have heard many German references to "English perfidy" and "treachery," but I have never yet been given a single bit of evidence in regard to such treachery. England *has* been fearful of German invasion and of German aggression upon Belgium, for the safety of which she made herself responsible, but there could, in fact, never have been any interest on the part of

England in making aggression against German territory or German power.

It is the American belief that Germany has introduced into this war practices, some of which in connection with the new mechanism of warfare establish barbarous and indefensible precedents for acts of a character never before known in civilised warfare.

The unwarranted invasion of Belgium, for the criminality of which there are various evidences, including the frank admissions of Von Bethmann-Hollweg and Von Jagow; the burning by order of Belgian cities; the taking of hostages and making these hostages responsible for individual acts (which were entirely out of their control); the shooting of these hostages; the armies' appropriation for their use of the great stores of food collected in Antwerp and elsewhere, so that the communities were left in a state of starvation, and that people, who are now under the claim of Berlin, subjects to Germany, have to be saved from death by the charity of the United States; and the imposition upon these devastated communities, in some cases after the formal annexation, of crushing indemnities; all constitute new and bad precedents in warfare.

In addition to these, the readiness to assail, whether by warships or by Zeppelins, women and children—measures that could in no way influence the course of campaigns—are filling Americans with indignation.

A large number of us here are now strongly in favour of our Government taking part with other neutral states, such as Italy and Scandinavia, to protest against what can only be described as futile barbarism.

With many friends in Germany and German friends on this side of the Atlantic, I can only still hope that when this craze for German domination has passed away (and it is, of course, perfectly natural that the citizens of a nation at war should have their judgment clouded in regard to the rightfulness of the

actions of their Government) the people of Germany may themselves be prepared to do their part towards bringing about such federation of the nations of Europe as to ensure continued peace.

AGNES REPPLIER.

Miss Agnes Repplier, author of several charming volumes of essays, is unquestionably one of the foremost woman writers in America. The following extracts are from a pamphlet entitled "Germany and Democracy : The Real Issue," which she wrote in conjunction with Dr. J. W. White (see page 160), in reply to Dr. Dernburg :—

The plain fact is that the longer the war lasts, and the more we read of the blundering diplomacy which preceded it, the perfidy with which it was inaugurated, the lame excuses, the contradictory denials, the insolent approvals of that blistering shame, and the preposterous "appeals" which, in terms of alternate flattery and bullying, have been addressed to the United States, the less we revere that mighty German brain, which, if full of knowledge, is correspondingly empty of wisdom.

' Knowledge is proud that it has learned so much,
Wisdom is humble that it knows no more.'

*

*

*

*

*

In good truth, *all* German apologists, writing to enlist the sympathy of Americans, should be made to understand the value of an understatement. If they would claim a little less, we could believe a great deal more. If they did not whitewash so vigorously, we should not suspect so much dirt. Herr Heinrich Friedrich Albert has contributed to the December issue of the *Atlantic Monthly* a paper on "German Methods of Conducting the War," which is more touchingly rose-coloured than anything even Doctor

Dernburg has written. War, so conducted, far from resembling Hell, is a pretty close approach to Heaven. The Prussian soldier, as painted by Herr Albert, is what old-fashioned people used to call "too good for earth." Shelley's apostrophe to Emilia Viviani :

"Seraph of Heaven ! too gentle to be human "

is the only description which can be found to fit him.

Of course, all charges of cruelty are swept aside as of "psychopathic origin." Herr Albert wastes no time on them, but proceeds at once to make clear to us the benignant nature of Zeppelins and airships, which are far more "humane" than artillery, and which, by compelling the speedy surrender of a fortress, "may spare many thousands of lives and property of incalculable value." Even when the bombs are dropped upon cities not under siege, "a calm and judicious consideration" will soften our prejudices against them. They were never intended, for example, to destroy life in Paris. "The bombs were meant for the wireless station on the Eiffel Tower." If the inconspicuous nature of the tower concealed it from observation, the blame, we presume, rests with the French, who should have built it higher.

*

*

*

*

*

But a treaty concerning "neutrality," in which the interests of five nations are involved, and by which, long in advance of war, each signatory binds itself not to acquire any advantage dependent upon the non-observance of such neutrality in time of war, is obviously made with particular reference to war and to war conditions.

The nation that disregards such a treaty, that repudiates for its own interests such an obligation, is like the person who cheats at cards. It should be regarded as outside the pale of civilised intercourse.

134 AMERICAN OPINIONS ON THE WAR

In the tangled web of falsehoods which have emanated from Germany's upholders, where shall we look for any word which we can accept with the confidence of a mind at rest?

After all, if reputable writers feel justified in doubting the declarations of Imperial Chancellors, Foreign Secretaries, titled Ambassadors, learned Professors, erudite Theologians, and anointed War Lords, why should we hesitate to suggest the unreliability of an ex-Colonial Secretary?

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

The following sentences are from an article written for "The New York Times" by Theodore Roosevelt, in reference to the conventions and regulations which were signed at The Hague by forty nations (among which were Germany, Great Britain, and the United States) during his term of office as President of the United States :—

The United States and all the great Powers now at war were parties to the international code created in the regulations annexed to the Hague conventions of 1899 and 1907. As President, acting on behalf of this Government, and in accordance with the unanimous wish of our people, I ordered the signature of the United States to these conventions. Most emphatically I would not have permitted such a farce to have gone through if it had entered my head that this Government would not consider itself bound to do all it could to see that the regulations to which it made itself a party were actually observed when the necessity for their observance arose. I cannot imagine any sensible nation thinking it worth while to sign future Hague conventions if even such a powerful neutral as the United States does not care enough about them to protest against their open breach . . . If the Hague conventions represented nothing but the expression of feeble aspirations toward decency, uttered only in time of profound peace, and not to be even expressed above a whisper when with awful bloodshed and suffering the conventions were broken, then it was idle folly to enter into them. If, on the other hand, they meant anything, if the United States had a serious purpose, a serious sense of its obligations to world righteousness,

when it entered into them, then its plain duty as the trustee of civilisation is to investigate the charges solemnly made as to the violation of the Hague conventions. If such investigation is made, and if the charges prove well founded, then it is the duty of the United States to take whatever action may be necessary to vindicate the principles of international law set forth in these conventions.

*

*

*

*

*

Many Germans assert and believe that if Germany had not acted as she did, France and England would have invaded Belgium and have committed similar wrongs. In such case it would have been our clear duty to behave toward them exactly as we ought now to behave towards Germany. But the fact that other Powers might under other conditions do wrong affords no justification for failure to act on the wrong that has actually been committed.

FRANKLIN BENJAMIN SANBORN.

Franklin Benjamin Sanborn, author, and Editor of the "Springfield Republican" from 1868 to 1914, is one of the founders of the American Social Science Association, the National Prison Association, and other useful social movements. He was a friend of Emerson, and has written lives of Emerson, Thoreau, John Brown, Alcott, and others. His "Recollections of Seventy Years" is also an interesting and notable book. Mr. Sanborn contributed the following letter to the "Springfield Republican" on January 4th, 1915 :—

A distant cousin of mine, Herbert Sanborn, led in the by-paths of destiny to be a college professor in Tennessee, at the Vanderbilt university, has just sent me a batch of documents, which he must think important, and apparently intended to draw me from the error of my ways in favouring peace and arbitration, rather than war with the ruin of peaceful Belgium. They are a scurrilous magazine called *Free Lance*, and a still more scurrilous pamphlet, whose authorship is divided between a son of the heathen prophets, called Balaam, Jr., and a descendant of the ass that converted the ancient Balaam ; and, finally, a meek and lowly epistle from my friend, Rudolph Eucken of Jena, in which he sorrows over the contumacy of his American friends in declining to take the word of Kaiser William for both law and gospel. The first two tracts are intended to raise the Irish into rebellion against all the world except Germany, Austria, and Turkey, and are not worth reading. The third is a pathetic instance of the ease with which a college professor, of excellent principles, can be made to talk bad logic when he is excited. A worthy Tennessee church member once said of his brother in the bonds of church fellowship :—

“ Our deacon is an excellent man — no better man in the world. He has but one fault—he will swear when he gets drunk.”

The amiable Jena professor writes to his young friend in Nashville, who prints the letter—perhaps put into English by another friend of mine in Germany, whose English is more manageable than Dr. Eucken’s—as follows, in a tone of grief :—

“ With good reasons we endeavour to convince the rest of the world of the justice of our cause ; but again and again the answer comes back, ‘ You are fighting for militarism ; and it is impossible for us to have any sympathy with that.’ What is the meaning of militarism ? If one means by this word a preponderance of military interests over cultural undertakings, then this is by no means the case with Germany.”

So far, and far more, Eucken. But I, by no means unfamiliar with Belgium before its invasion, turn my eyes towards that once happy and industrious land, now held by myriads of invading Germans, led by their Prussian princes, and which do I see there, military interests or cultural undertakings ? Was the destruction of the old Catholic university of Louvain a “ cultural undertaking ? ” Was the burning of Aerschot and the shooting of its citizens a “ military interest,” or what was it ? Has the ruin of most of the industries of their country, the levy of millions of marks on selected Belgian cities, or the reduction of millions of worthy fellow-beings to pauperism been a cultured undertaking ? Upon which of four crowned rulers of nations (the two Kaisers, the Russian Czar, or the Fifth George of England) we finally fix the blame for this most barbarous war, the prophetic verse of Emerson in his “ Boston Hymn ” of January, 1863, gives the story of their culpability :—

"God said, 'I am tired of kings!
 I suffer them no more;
 Up to my ear the morning brings
 The outrage of the poor.
 Think ye I made this ball
 A field of havoc and war,
 Where tyrants great and tyrants small
 Might harry the weak and poor?"

If the weak and poor in any war, by any tyrant, from Macedonia's madman to the Bulgarian Czar, ever were harried worse than we have seen done to the Belgians, it has escaped the notice of history. Kings may divide the blame among them; but the American people say, "Such barbarism must cease if monarchies cease with it."

On this point there is little difference of view among the people of the United States; and the more German generals, those doctors of war, and professors, those doctors of philosophy, labour to instruct us in their new theory of "defensive" war, the less are we persuaded. We say with Emerson, "What you are speaks so loud that we cannot hear what you say."

ELIZABETH SERGEANT.

Elizabeth Sergeant is a contributor to "The New Republic," and other American periodicals, who has made herself more or less of an authority on French topics. The following extracts are from a letter written to a French friend on December 18th, and afterwards reprinted in the "Entretiens des non-combattants durant la guerre" :—

Nous sommes absolument certains de la victoire des Alliés. Tout ce que font les Allemands semble appeler un châtiment final. Ils ne tiennent aucun compte de l'opinion publique internationale et continuent à se conduire, comme si le monde ne les jugeait pas sur leurs actes ; et pourtant le monde les juge. Ils nous envoient des émissaires de toute sorte pour essayer d'influencer l'opinion américaine ; mais plus ils parlent, moins les Américains croient à la justice de leur cause. Rien ne peut excuser la violation de la Belgique, ni ce qui s'est passé à Louvain et à Reims. Ils ont établi à New York un bureau qui publie chaque semaine des brochures : *La Juste Cause de l'Allemagne*, *La Vérité sur l'Allemagne*, qui sont pleines de faussetés et de mensonges. Ils ont essayé d'acheter la presse américaine ; n'y ayant pas réussi, ils prétendent que les journaux de New York sont à la solde de l'Angleterre. En fait, les journaux publient les nouvelles d'origine allemande tout comme les autres. Nous recevons les communiqués officiels de tous les belligérents ; le Livre Blanc allemand a été publié en même temps que le livre anglais ; et c'est justement sur ce Livre Blanc que nous nous fondons pour attribuer à la nation allemande la responsabilité

de la guerre, car on y voit, clair comme le jour, combien le gouvernement allemand a été insincère, évasif, et peu désireux de joindre ses efforts à ceux des autres gouvernements en faveur de la paix.

*

*

*

*

*

Les Allemands d'Amérique sont nombreux, surtout dans le Middle West, et il y en a qui disent qu' ils ne se battraient pas pour l'Amérique ! Ce qui ne les empêche pas de se faire naturaliser au plus vite ! A l'Orchestre Symphonique de Boston, presque tous les musiciens français out rejoint, tandis que les Allemands se faisaient naturaliser ! Cela se sait, et c'est pour moi une satisfaction de voir que la France est comprise et appréciée chez nous comme elle ne l'avait jamais été auparavant. Ceux qui se trouvaient en France au moment de la déclaration de guerre, et depuis, sont revenus avec un sentiment qui est presque une admiration religieuse pour votre patriotisme. L'idée populaire, celle qu'on rapporte des boulevards et de la lecture des romans "jaunes," que la France est un pays frivole, cette idée-là a fait son temps.

*

*

*

*

*

La liberté de penser : voilà la grande chose que les Alliés représentent à nos yeux, et nous sentons que vous vous battez pour nous, pour la justice, l'humanité et la liberté contre ce terrible "instinct de la ruche" du Prussien, qui aboutit à détruire toute individualité et à supprimer toute liberté de jugement.

ALBERT SHAW.

Albert Shaw, LL.D., is Editor of the "American Review of Reviews," and author of many works and articles on political science, economics, and municipal government. The following paragraphs are from a private letter of February 4th, 1915 :—

While it is the practically unanimous opinion of thoughtful people here that the Allies must and will be victorious in the end, there is an intense desire that the peace should come before the exhaustion of human and material resources has become so great as to set Europe back for a century or two.

I was in Washington yesterday, talking with a good many public men, and following the course of the Ship Purchase Bill. The prospect that the Bill will go through is diminishing, and in any case it is no longer believed that our Government will do anything that could lead to friction or trouble.

ALBION W. SMALL.

Albion W. Small, LL.D., is Editor of the "American Journal of Sociology," and Professor of Sociology and Dean of the Graduate School of Art and Literature in the University of Chicago. The following is his reply to Mr. O. J. Merkel, Secretary of the German University League of New York, who wrote to him asking him to comment upon the statement of Professors Eucken and Haeckel, of the University of Jena, to the Universities of America, relating to Germany's position in the War :—

Probably the most appropriate reply which I can make to your circular will be the copy of a letter, dated October 29th, to my long time friend, Professor Simmel of Strassburg. He had written a long letter, which was in substance an amplification of the statement that all the world had been lying about the Germans, but the Germans had the whole truth about themselves and the rest of the world. I have no evidence that the letter has ever reached him, as nothing has come to hand in answer to the request that he would acknowledge its arrival.

Venturing to speak somewhat more personally, not on questions directly involved in the war itself but on the question, once removed, of the relation of German professors to those problems, I take the liberty in the first place of indicating my own attitude toward the Germans in general and toward German scientific methodology in particular.

My wife is German. She comes of an old Prussian *officierfamilie*. We were married in Berlin in 1881. Practically all my professional equipment was obtained

either directly from the Germans or indirectly through modification and reconstruction on the basis of work previously done by the Germans. During my whole academic life my thinking has been influenced more by the Germans than by all the rest of the world put together.

For thirty years I have been trying to impress on my students my own belief that Americans have more to learn from the Germans than from any other people in the world. Nothing that can take place in the present war is likely to alter this belief fundamentally, although I have already qualified it in important particulars. For twenty years I have been classed by my own special colleagues in sociology as a man with the one idea of transplanting Germanism into American thought and life.

With such a record I can be accused of prepossession against the Germans only by the type of reaction which has seemed to be general since August 1st among German professors.

Men of my age in academic positions in the United States, in nearly all departments, have had as their preceptors practically the same German scholars of the next older generation with whom our contemporaries in the German universities had their training. We feel that we have substantially the same right to stand in judgment over our German colleagues which they assert toward each other. In the exercise of that right I am obliged with sorrow to testify that in my judgment the present crisis has overtaxed the wisdom of German professors.

The fundamental requirement of German scientific methodology for a century has been objectivity. The astonishing fact in every utterance about the war which has reached this country from German professors has been the utter collapse of an objective attitude as viewed from this detached standpoint.

Whether the explanation lies chiefly in the extra-

ordinary means which the German Government commands for manufacturing public opinion and which has led to acceptance of a governmentally dictated mythology as ultimate data in place of analytical examination of the facts, or in the extraordinary emotional stimulus of the situation, or in a combination of the two, together with other causes, I am not in a position to judge. So far as I am able to ascertain, at least nineteen out of every twenty American academic men of the class I have referred to, and similar men who are our juniors, have reached substantially my estimate of present academic thinking in Germany.

From our point of view the circular which you inclose, signed by Profs. Eucken and Haeckel, so pitifully betrays arrest of critical processes that it has had the effect upon judicial Americans of a studied insult to our intelligence.

It is difficult for us to believe that men whom we have regarded as paragons of scientific method can so flagrantly abandon the elements of critical procedure, unless they assume that Americans are incapable of detecting plain substitution of opinion for reality. The outstanding facts are that the German Government came to the conclusion that the psychological moment had arrived for the irrepressible conflict in the interest of what a recent German author has called "the German idea in the world."

As a primary counsel of expediency the German Government felt bound to strike the first blow instead of waiting to be attacked. As a secondary device of strategy the German Government came to strike that blow at a spot where it was inevitable that not only France and Russia but England would counter. If the German professors had faced the literal truth, and if they had said, "We have confidence in our Government's judgment of expediency and of strategy, and we are prepared to take the consequences," American

professors would at least have retained respect for their intellectual integrity.

Instead of this the German professors have lent themselves to the preposterous stultification which has received its latest phrasing in the alleged language of the Kaiser's New Year's address to the army and navy: "the entire nation . . . prepared to sacrifice its heart's blood for the sacred domestic hearth which we are defending against outrageous invasion."

In my judgment German needs in the present war would have been judged less severely in America if there had been no German special pleading in attempted palliation of the deeds. At all events, Germany has been placed in an unfortunate light whenever German professors have tried to influence American opinion about the war. Until German professors are in a radically different state of mind from that which they have manifested during the present crisis they will serve their country best and they will most surely recover the prestige which American professors have gladly acknowledged if they will refrain from further efforts to mould American opinion about the merits of the European struggle.

I have no desire to have this reply treated as "confidential and not for publication." On the contrary, I wish it might reach every person who has heard of the original letter from Profs. Eucken and Haeckel.

LANGDON CHEVES STEWARDSON.

The following extracts are from letters by the Rev. Langdon Cheves Stewardson, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Philosophy at Lehigh University from 1898 to 1903, and President of Hobart College from 1903 to 1913 :—

A really great nation cannot afford to ignore its signature to an international document, neither would it be willing to do so ; at least, so it seems to me. But then, one is forced to explain what one means by such words. That a great nation is obliged to go to war with all its co-signatories of a given treaty who fail to keep their word, can hardly be contended. That a great nation should undoubtedly protest, and that vigorously, against such a breach of faith, I certainly believe. But here again, I suppose we ought to distinguish, at least in certain cases and in special circumstances, between the officials of the Government and the people at large. Officials, like President Wilson for example, may feel they can best promote the common good by studiously refraining from taking sides in the conflict in order that they may act all the better when called upon to play the rôle of mediators. What may be necessary or expedient for officials cannot, on the other hand, be urged with justice upon the people of the nation at large. If these were to remain silent in such a case as that of Germany *versus* Belgium, the very stones would cry out. And the American people have not been silent. I have yet to meet an American citizen, save citizens of the German-American variety, who is not heart and soul with the Allies, and full of loathing for the Kaiser and

all his works. That this public opinion should be organised, I devoutly believe.

* * * * *

As for myself, I am English, heart and soul. I, for one, feel and recognise no division line between your country and mine. In this fight the very basis of our common civilisation, our common heritage of liberty, justice, honour, and mercy, are being assailed by an enemy who shows in his every act that he is bent upon destroying what the intellectual and moral heroisms of our race have built up.

CHARLES WILLIAM SUPER.

Charles William Super, author, and President of Ohio University from 1884 to 1901, contributed a letter to "The Nation" (New York), from which we quote the following paragraph relating to Rheims Cathedral :—

Thousands of persons throughout the entire world, not excepting Germany, who have had the good fortune to look upon that gem of architectural beauty in its pristine loveliness, and who now have the melancholy privilege of comparing their recollection with photographs of it in its condition of irreparable ruin, will not only feel their hearts bleed, as did that of the Kaiser for Louvain ; they will also feel rising in them the fires of indignation against the perpetrators of such wanton destruction, that will not burn themselves out as long as they live. And, by the way, how long has it been since the Germans have discovered that the Russians are barbarians ? We may take it for granted as an axiom that any man or set of men who will justify almost any conceivable atrocity on the grounds of military necessity will also justify lying on the same ground.

WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT.

William Howard Taft, President of the United States from 1909 to 1913, wrote the following letter in answer to Professor von Mach, who had written to him on January 24th, 1915, asking him to send a letter to be read at a "Neutrality Meeting":—

MY DEAR PROFESSOR VON MACH.—I have yours of January 24th. I cannot write to a neutrality meeting such a letter as you would wish. I think that to interdict the supply of ammunition and arms from this country to the belligerents in the war would be to adopt a policy that would seriously interfere with our own welfare, should we ever be drawn into a war against our will by the unjust invasion of some Power who was fully prepared, and who would always find us unprepared. Such a policy as that you indicate would mean that the Power who is armed *cap-à-pie* would always have at a disadvantage those countries that were not in such a state of preparation. It would, therefore, lead to even greater pressure upon all the countries of the world than that we have seen in the last two decades to increase their armaments, a result which we would all deplore. For this reason, I cannot think that it would be wise to pass a law changing all the rules of international law heretofore prevailing with regard to the sale of ammunition and arms to belligerents by neutral countries. Nor do I think that in the present exigency it would be an act of neutrality to do so, because it would inure only to the benefit of one of the belligerents.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. TAFT.

JAMES MONROE TAYLOR.

The Rev. James M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D., President of Vassar College, wrote the following letter to the Editor of "The New York Times" (January 23rd, 1915) :—

I read recently in your paper an appeal from Herman Ridder to our fellow-citizens of German descent to combine for the furtherance of German ideals of power and "culture" among Americans. The appeal was so violent in spirit that many characterised it as "plain treason"; it would be juster to call it merely seditious. Under German ideals, as exemplified in Berlin, such an article addressed to Americans, British, French, would have landed its writer in jail and led to the suppression of his paper. But let that pass. My purpose is to ask: What will be the effect on America, if such appeals as Mr. Ridder's are successful?

First, the effort is distinctly pro-German, not German-American. No protest of Mr. Ridder can render his words less than an attack on American ideals and American civilisation. It is pro-American *only if* German ideals are incorporated in American life and dominate it. No one quarrels with one's love for his native land, but one may take exception to the use of American soil, American hospitality, American freedom, to build up an association meant to be inimical to American ideals and distinctively American interests. If Mr. Ridder's appeal to the German-Americans does not mean just that, his language is surely misleading.

Secondly, the effects of this German type of thought—Anti-American, as it seems to me—are seen in the recurrence of efforts to embroil us with Japan, a country entirely friendly and with which we have no occasion of quarrel. Some will recall the amazingly impertinent letter of the Secretary of the German-American Chamber of Commerce to Governor Johnson of California—for Germany's sake and without a thought of American interests. More are listening now to the words of the German-American Congressmen who are working so strongly for the interests of Germany—and against our own. One of them warns us of our need of such an ally as Germany in case we fall into war with Japan. In that timely little volume of addresses and articles by Japanese leaders, entitled "Japan to America" (Putnams), a danger to peace is suggested by one writer in the very composite of our citizenship, and in the influence of non-Americans who may be for various reasons hostile to Japan. What, in this connection, does Mr. Ridder's proposed combination imply? Every German whose love of his native land is paramount is embittered afresh by Germany's loss in war of the territory which she robbed from China so outrageously a few years ago. Such a bid as Mr. Ridder's is a call to all such Germans to foment trouble with Japan—for *the sake of Germany*, and regardless of any American friendship or interest or of the broader interests of humanity.

Just here such appeals need watching by all lovers of America. They are encouragements of bitterness, of provincialism, sectionalism, antagonism to American freedom and American patriotism. *Our national* interests must be sacrificed for those of the "Fatherland"!

Thirdly, one may not lose sight here of Bernhardt's insistence on Mr. Ridder's principle. Till lately the paragraph on the German-Irish coalition in the grim and cold-blooded pages of the General was a puzzle

to many of us. It seemed to be part of the misinformation which was so abundant in the offices of the German administration. Now it seems partly justified by the union of the extreme wing of the Irish—survivals of an old bitterness—and some Germans led by a professor who freely abuses the hospitality of a neutral country by an unseemly and ill-timed address. Mr. Ridder's union means much more of this, more hate of American law, more bitterness—a base for an attack of old foes, *not America's*, but Ireland's, Poland's, Hungary's, Germany's. Again, this is sedition, without a germ of patriotism. Because the mass of Mr. Ridder's fellow-citizens—albeit most of us lovers of Germany and the Germans—believe Germany chiefly at fault for the present occurrences of war, he will create a party of German nationalists, distinctly consecrated to Teutonism, opposed to the root-ideas of American liberty, a source of demoralisation and disorder in American life.

I believe too fully in the German citizens of America to think the appeal can have a lasting effect, but none the less it needs watching, as stamped by an unpatriotic spirit, by a love of Germany that surpasses regard for American interests, by a spirit of bitterness that would even plunge America into foreign war to further German ideals and to aid Germany in its present dire strait. This is not patriotism, it is pure alienism. No wonder that one of your correspondents says plainly that Germans like himself would never fight against Germany for their adopted country. Some of us are wondering if he and his sort would *fight against us*!

GLANVILLE TERRELL.

Glanville Terrell, Professor of Greek in the State University of Kentucky, wrote a letter to "The Nation" (New York) of November 19th, 1914, from which we quote the following paragraph :—

Let us consider for a moment the possible result of victory for the Allies on the one hand and Germany on the other. Who can doubt that the English sense of shame, their "decent respect to the opinions of mankind," their national characteristic of self-restraint, their hypocrisy, if you will, would temper their terms by some show of fairness and justice? For somehow the English have gained the reputation of being a just people. Stolid and stupid they may be, but they are able to appreciate the point of view of the other fellow. This accounts for their marvellous success in governing alien peoples, and no more striking proof of this was ever exhibited in the world than the present loyalty of Britain's colonies and dependencies. This demonstration of the solidarity of the Empire must seem to an Englishman as a partial compensation for the cost of the war. On the other hand, what could we expect from a victorious Germany dictating the terms of peace? Brazen-faced candour, no doubt, an unshakable disregard for the opinions of the rest of mankind, the fate of Belgium for all who oppose her, the most solemn pledges of faith and honour reduced to a "scrap of paper," the triumph of the doctrine of might and the divine right of kings; a veritable Saturnalia of "woe to the conquered" and all who stand in the way of her superior culture and new morality.

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

William Roscoe Thayer, LL.D., L.H.D., Litt.D., Knight of the Order of the Crown of Italy, is the author of the "Life and Times of Cavour" (1911), and many other works. The following is a letter contributed by him to the "Boston Herald" on February 1st, 1915 :—

The American people have a great store of patience, but after reading the reports of the seditious meetings of the so-called German-Americans and other aliens in Washington on Saturday night and in Symphony Hall, Boston, last night, there are signs that our patience may be stretched too far.

That a meeting of aliens, in fact or intent, should arrogate to itself to tell the American President, Congress, and people what to do, has its humorous side. It has also a very serious side. In Washington and here, these connivers at sedition scarcely attempted to disguise the purpose which they have held since the war began—the purpose of embroiling the United States with England and France, to drive us into war, if possible, and thereby to aid Germany. In Washington they even went so far as to threaten any future candidate for any office who does not now do their German bidding.

Evidently they have misinterpreted the long silence of the American people. Unable to persuade us by their apologies, they imagine they can terrorise us by mass meetings, by vituperation, and by open or covert threats.

In this country there are ninety or more million persons who, whatever their racial origin, will never suffer a seditious foreign faction to use the national

government for the benefit of any foreign nation. Among the naturalised Germans here there are many who repudiate the methods of the Prussian propagandists, no matter what disguise these may wear. When President Wilson and Secretary Bryan receive the resolutions which the officers of last night's meeting were instructed to send them, they will treat them as the Kaiser would treat similar directions from Russians holding a "neutral" meeting in Berlin.

ROLAND USHER.

Roland Usher, Professor of History at Washington University, published rather more than a year ago a little book entitled "Pan-Germanism." This, of course, appeared before the war, but his "prophetic" utterances in reference to the great struggle are so pertinent that they seem to find a place quite naturally in this collection. They are given by permission of Messrs. Constable & Co. :—

The Germans aim at nothing less than the domination of Europe and of the world by the Germanic race. One of the fundamental errors, of which idealists and advocates of peace have often been guilty, is to treat this vast project as an unreality. In fact, it is already half accomplished. An equally mistaken view declares it the conception of an individual which chances to find for the moment a response in the German people, or a scheme which depends for its existence upon the transient personal influence of a few men. No doubt, a few men only know the full details of the plans for the realisation of this stupendous enterprise, but the whole nation is none the less fired by their spirit and is working as a unit in accordance with their directions. It is literally true that Germany has "become Bismarckian. His heavy spirit has settled upon it. It wears his scowl. It has adopted his brutality, as it has his greatness. It has taken his criterion of truth, which is Germanic ; his indifference to justice, which is savage ; his conception of a state, which is sublime. This nation has forgotten God in its exaltation of the Germanic race."

*

*

*

*

*

As the situation looks at present, nothing short of the breaking of the alliance between England, France, the United States, and Russia can permit the German scheme to obtain anything more than a temporary and partial success. The first three of these Allies cannot leave the alliance without endangering everything they hold dear. The fourth can do so only by the renunciation of ambitions which have been the very backbone of Russian policy ever since Russia herself emerged upon the plane of European politics.

BARRETT WENDELL.

Barrett Wendell, Litt.D., is Professor of English at Harvard University, and the author of many books, including a "History of Literature in America." The following paragraphs are from a private letter of February 9th, 1915 :—

Even still, though, I can discover in these parts—and, so far as I know, elsewhere in America—no need to emphasise the justice of the English cause. At first the sentiment was so strong as to make me fear serious reaction. Instead, what seems to me to have occurred is rather a process of solidification. Less warm, perhaps, the feeling of America remains, I think, remarkably sound and strong.

In this state of things, the very obvious efforts of the Germans to excite sympathy with their cause have had exactly the opposite effect. Nothing in Germany to-day is so deeply characteristic as inability to imagine, and thus far to conciliate, any state of mind other than the German. Essentially forbidding brutes can't make friends by wagging their tails. The more they do so, the less one loves them.

J. WILLIAM WHITE.

J. William White, M.D., LL.D., Emeritus Professor of Surgery and Trustee of the University of Pennsylvania, has published a very interesting little book called, "A Primer of the War for Americans," reproduced in England under the title of "America's Arraignment of Germany" (T. Fisher Unwin, Ltd., London, price 1s. net). The following paragraphs are from the summary of his conclusions :—

The war is a German-made war, having its source and inspiration in the writings and teachings of the Pan-Germanists; in the ambitions of an autocratic military caste, headed by a highly neurotic, unbalanced, and possibly mentally diseased overlord, with mediæval views of his relation to his country and the world, and supported by a subservient corps of "learned men," the majority of whom are paid servants of the State.

* * * * *

As an immediate step towards the attainment of her purpose, Germany violated a solemn contract entered into deliberately, seventy-five years ago, and affirmed and reaffirmed by her representatives almost up to the date of its abrupt and deliberate and undenied infraction.

* * * * *

The Allies are fighting for democratic liberty, for representative government, for the equal rights of individuals, whether relatively insignificant persons or relatively powerless states.

So far as America is concerned, Germany and her

parasites stand for everything in which we do not believe. The Allies represent—and are fighting, starving, and dying for—everything that makes American liberty, happiness, and independence possible.

Our technical position is one of “neutrality,” but our overwhelming sympathy is with the Allies.

JASPER WHITING.

Jasper Whiting is an author and journalist of Boston, Massachusetts. The following sentences are from a private letter :—

The sentiment here, both among the upper and middle classes, is strongly for the Allies ; and the best information I can get, supplementing my own personal experience, indicates that the feeling is the same in the central part of this country. I have recently been to Chicago and into a portion of rural Wisconsin, which, as you know, is largely peopled by men and women of German birth or parentage, and I was surprised to find, even among these, that the militarism of Germany did not strike a responsive chord.

FREDERICK W. WHITRIDGE.

Frederick W. Whitridge, LL.D., a leading member of the New York Bar, married to Lucy, daughter of Matthew Arnold, and Special Ambassador to Spain on the occasion of King Alphonso's marriage (1906), has published a little book entitled "One American's Opinion of the European War," from which the following sentences are quoted :—

For many years certain German publicists have been writing about "a day of reckoning with England." They have not been very explicit about the account on which the reckoning was to be had, but generally the day of reckoning was that upon which it was to be decided whether many desirable things in the possession of England should be taken away and made German. For nearly as many years also the youth of Germany, especially in the navy, have been drinking to the toast of "The Day."

"The Day" has at last come, and brought with it the most gigantic and the most wicked war of the whole Christian era.

* * * * *

It is as clear to me as the daylight that the invasion of the neutrality of Belgium was the proximate cause of the war, at least with Great Britain; and there is a sufficient amount of evidence to make it equally clear that Germany had long been preparing for the war, and intended to have it about this time, before even the particular pretext for it was found.

* * * * *

When the Germans ask for sympathy in these United States, I venture to assert that they will get precious little of it, because we are essentially a business people, a civil and kindly people, and because we are not a cruel people.

* * * * *

I have, however, been surprised at the number of native Germans who say: "The Kaiser is dead wrong this time," and who are not German sympathisers in this war at all. Among the native-born Americans the feeling is almost wholly in favour of the Allies, and among the hundreds, and even thousands, of Americans also like myself who have lived and studied in Germany, I believe the fact to be that the overwhelming majority now think of the Fatherland as they would think of an old friend who had gone out of his mind. We believe the Germans to be crazed by militarism and the contemplation of their own greatness and power.

* * * * *

The main difficulty, however, with the German colonies would be the Germans themselves. When they go out into the great world they do not want, as Bernhardi says, to find a German way of living, but they want to find a better way. I heard recently from a friend of a case in point. He met a German merchant in one of the towns of British South Africa, and said to him: "What are you doing here? I should think you would be at such and such a place"—the capital town of the nearest German colony. The German replied: "I went there, and when I got out at the station there was a German sentry with a gun. When I went to the Commissioner's house there was another sentry with a gun. After I got into the house there was a large room all full of German red

tape. So I got away and came here, where I have done very well."

*

*

*

*

*

You (Germans) are unanimous to-day, and splendid in your futile endeavours to realise your ideals, but General Nogi, the conqueror of Port Arthur, is reported to have said: "I foresee two more wars, one of which will be fought out on the plains of Belgium, and will leave Germany so beaten and terrified that there will not be another war for a hundred years, and perhaps never." Listen again to the prayers of more millions than you can ever hope to be, that such may be the result of this war, and renounce your false gods, mind your own business; give us back the Germany of Luther, Beethoven, Goethe, Schiller, and Kant, and try to recognise that your function on this earth is not to own it, but is to fertilise other peoples—as you have been doing for a thousand years.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 910 407 6

